











THE
FAITH OF OUR FOREFATHERS:

AN EXAMINATION

OF

ARCHBISHOP GIBBONS'S "FAITH OF
OUR FATHERS."

BY

THE REV. EDWARD J. STEARNS, D.D.,

Examining Chaplain of the Diocese of Easton.

AUTHOR OF "THE AFTERPIECE TO THE COMEDY OF CONVOCATION," "BIRTH AND NEW
BIRTH," ETC.

"From the beginning it was not so."—St. Matt. xix. 8.

NEW YORK:
THOMAS WHITTAKER,
2 AND 3 BIBLE HOUSE.

1879.



THE LIBRARY
OF CONGRESS

WASHINGTON

BX 1765
S82

COPYRIGHT, 1879, BY T. WHITTAKER.

1. 979

CONTENTS.

10

CHAPTER	PAGE
Introduction.....	I
I. The Blessed Trinity, the Incarnation, etc.....	7
II. Unity of the Church.....	7
III. Holiness of the Church.....	17
IV. Catholicity.....	27
V. Apostolicity.....	32
VI. Perpetuity of the Church.....	46
VII. Infallible Authority of the Church.....	47
VIII. The Church and the Bible.....	61
IX. The Primacy of Peter.....	112
X. The Supremacy of the Pope.....	142
XI. Infallibility of the Popes.....	167
XII. Temporal Power of the Popes.....	179
XIII. Invocation of Saints.....	188
XIV. Sacred Images.....	204
XV. Purgatory and Prayers for the Dead.....	218
XVI. Civil and Religious Liberty.....	238
XVII. Charges of Religious Persecution.....	261
XVIII. Grace — The Sacraments — Original Sin — Baptism — Its Necessity — Its Effects — Manner of Baptising.....	277
XIX. Confirmation.....	283
XX. The Holy Eucharist.....	286

CHAPTER	PAGE
XXI. Communion under One Kind.....	301
XXII. The Sacrifice of the Mass.....	305
XXIII. Religious Ceremonies.....	311
XXIV. Ceremonies of the Mass—The Missal—Latin Language— Lights—Flowers—Incense—Vestments.....	314
XXV. Penance.....	322
XXVI. Indulgences.....	359
XXVII. Extreme Unction.....	361
XXVIII. The Priesthood.....	362
XXIX. Celibacy of the Clergy.....	363
XXX. Matrimony.....	367

PREFACE.

THE preparation of the following pages, undertaken at the earnest request of the Assistant Bishop of Maryland, has been a task of no little difficulty, owing to the character of the work under examination. I thought I knew something of the windings-in-and-out of Roman controversialists ; but the Archbishop's book, in this respect, goes beyond any that has fallen under my observation. The unscholarly way, too, in which he cites his authorities, particularly on important points, makes it exceedingly difficult to follow him up. For instance, on page 245 we have the Reference, "Blue-Laws" (!) ; on page 252, "The Ottoman and Spanish Empires, by Leopold Ranke ;" on page 371, "Systema Theol." (of Leibnitz), "Remarques sur l'Olympe" (of Voltaire), "Emile" (of Rousseau) ; and, on other pages, a score or two of other, similar, references ; in every instance, without chapter and verse. I do not complain of his citing authorities at second hand ; but he should at least let us have chapter and verse of the

original, as given by his second-hand authorities, when those authorities are of his own Communion.

But slovenliness of Reference is not by any means the worst fault of the book. Let the reader turn to pages 113 and 114, 336-338, 341, 342, of what follows, and read what I have there laid before him, and . . .

But the pity of it, Iago ; the pity of it !

EASTON, MARYLAND, June, 1879.

INTRODUCTION.

THE "little volume," as it styles itself, which is here brought under review, and which, according to the imprint on the title-page of the copy now lying before me, has already, though given to the public less than two years ago, reached its "fortieth thousand," is as remarkable for what it does not contain, as for what it does. Though its "object," as stated in the preface, is, "to present in a plain and practical form, an exposition and a vindication of the principal tenets of the Catholic Church," meaning thereby the Church under the headship of the bishop of Rome, I have been able to detect, in the course of a careful reading and re-reading of the book, not so much as even an allusion to the Roman doctrine of Justification; the briefest and barest mention of works of supererogation and the "Treasury" of the merits of the saints, not a syllable of any special invocation of the Virgin Mary as distinguished from the other saints; and only nine lines—six of them two hundred and thirty-three pages apart from the other three—of "exposition and vindication" of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin!

Here is absolutely all that I can find, from beginning to end of the four hundred and thirty-three pages, on what are commonly called Works of Supererogation: "An indulgence is simply a remission in whole or in part, through the *superabundant merits* of Jesus

Christ and *his saints*, [italics mine], of the temporal punishment due to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted" (p. 385). "Those, however, who contributed nothing [to the completion of St. Peter's], shared equally *in the treasury* [italics mine] of the Church, provided they complied with the essential conditions for gaining the indulgence" (p. 391).

Who would gather from this "exposition and vindication," that the merits of the saints—that is, the good works they have done *over and above what they are required to do*—form a "treasure," of which the Pope holds the key, and which he can set over to the account of those, on earth or in purgatory, who have not done so much as is required of them, and thereby supply to them what they lack?

And *here* is all that I can find, in the whole four hundred and thirty-three pages, on the Immaculate Conception: "In the doctrine of the supreme power of Peter, as the visible foundation of the Church, we have the *implied* assertion [italics his] of many rights and duties which belong to the centre of unity. In the revelation of the supereminent dignity and purity of the Blessed Virgin, there is implied her exemption from Original Sin, etc., etc." (p. 30). "Hence Pascal truly says that man is a greater mystery to himself without Original Sin, than is the mystery itself.

"The Church, however, declares that the Blessed Virgin Mary was exempted from the stain of Original Sin by the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ; and that, consequently, she was never for an instant subject to the dominion of Satan. This is what is meant by the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception" (p. 263).

Here is the whole "exposition and *vindication*," and coupling it with the absolute silence of the book on any special veneration of the Virgin above that of the other saints, and contrasting it with the well-known

and universal practice of the Roman Church, we may well say, We have here the tragedy of Hamlet with the part of Hamlet left out. Evidently, the Archbishop, writing, as he is, to Protestants, keeps in mind the saying of the wise man, *Surely, in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird!* I commend his *prudence*, but would much rather be able to commend his candor. To be open and aboveboard is best, in the long run, even as a matter of policy; and even if it were not, it ought to commend itself to a Christian man, not to say an Archbishop and Metropolitan.

But I fear that straightforwardness is not a characteristic of the Archbishop; for, I am sorry to say, I have detected him in a gross and glaring misrepresentation of Luther's teaching on communion under one kind, leaving out in the first line of his citation two words on which the whole hinges, and stopping short of the end of the sentence, when if he had gone on and completed it, and given the next paragraph, his readers would have seen that he was making Luther teach exactly the contrary of what he did teach.

But Luther was "a heretic." How is it with the Catholics? the real ones, I mean, of the olden time; not the new-fangled Roman ones? Does the Archbishop treat them any better? No! for, again I am sorry to say, I have detected him in a garbling of St. Basil, in what purports to be a continuous and consecutive quotation from the *Regulæ Breves*—lumping into one continuous paragraph sentences that are *only* twenty four folio pages (of the Benedictine edition) apart from each other, and stopping short, in the first part of the quotation, with a period, where St. Basil puts a comma, because to have given the rest of the sentence, which could have been done in half a dozen lines, *would have defeated the purpose for which the citation was made!* The proof of this will come in due time.*

* See chapters xxi. and xxv.

The Archbishop's "Introduction" begins: "MY DEAR READER—Perhaps this is the first time in your life that you have handled a book in which the doctrines of the Catholic [meaning thereby the Roman] Church are expounded by one of her sons." No, it is *not* the first time. Had it been, I might have been surprised at the Archbishop's treatment of Luther and St. Basil; but having already *handled* more than one such book, I was prepared for such misrepresentations and garblings, and set myself to ferret them out. The two above referred to may serve as specimens; there are plenty more, as we shall see, before we get through.

"There is no Freemasonry," says the Archbishop (p. 13), "in the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church; she has no secrets to keep back." And yet he "keeps back" the Roman doctrine concerning Justification,—concerning the three "Holy Orders" of the ministry, priests, deacons, and subdeacons, instead of bishops, priests, and deacons,—concerning the *special* worship (*hyperdulia*) of the Virgin above that of the other saints; rather a significant "keeping back," for which, however, the Archbishop is responsible, and not the accredited teachings of his Church.

"And in coming to the [Roman] Church," continues the Archbishop (p. 15), "you are not entering a strange place, but you are returning to your Father's home. The house and furniture may look odd to you. But it is just the same as your forefathers left it three hundred years ago."

If this were true, the question would be whether they had cause to leave it; whether the house was tenantable to one who valued his soul's health too much to expose it to a spiritual malaria worse than the physical one of the Pomptine marshes. But it is *not* true. (For, in the first place, *our* forefathers did *not* leave it. On the contrary, they remained where they were;)

where they had been from the beginning ; in the old historic Church of their fathers. } They merely shook off a usurpation which king after king had conspired with pope after pope to fasten upon them, but against which they had, struggled, century after century, unsuccessfully, till, in the good providence of God, conspiring king and pope became contending king and pope, and the wrath of man was made to praise God, and the Church (in the end) to have her own again. And, in the second place, the "house" is *not* the same that it was when the usurper's grasp was taken off from the Church of England's throat. Then, and for thirty years thereafter, the two Churches had the same creeds, the Apostles,' the Nicene, and the Athanasian. But in 1564 Pope Pius IV. set forth a new creed that has ever since gone by his name, witnessing thereby to its own novelty. Verily, the "house" is *not* "just the same" that it was three hundred and odd years ago. It is not even the same that it was twenty-five years ago. Then Padre Vigil was "a good Catholic" though he denied the Immaculate Conception. But within a year thereafter he became "a bad Catholic," not from any change in him on that point (for there was none), but because the "house" had got adrift, while he kept to his moorings. Nay, it is not the same that it was ten years ago. For Döllinger, and Rheinkens, and Hertzog, were "good Catholics" then, though they denied the Infallibility of the Pope ; but they are "bad Catholics" now, not from any alteration in their faith upon that point (for it has not altered by the breadth of a hair), but because the "house" is changed, and they won't change with it. And yet, the Archbishop has the assurance to tell us that the "house" is "just the same" that it was in the time of our forefathers. Verily, he must think poorly of our reasoning powers, if he expects us to believe him ; too poorly, one would think, to wish to

proselyte us. For what accession, even to a society of feeble-minded persons and idiots, could such reasoners be?

Having thus disposed of all that needs disposing of in the Archbishop's Introduction, I now proceed to consider, chapter by chapter, the rest of the work. Some of the chapters can be dispatched in few words : others will require a fuller handling.

THE FAITH OF OUR FOREFATHERS.

CHAPTER I.

THE BLESSED TRINITY, THE INCARNATION, ETC.

THE first Chapter of the Archbishop's "little volume," as might be conjectured from its title, has nothing in it calling for observation, and I make mention of it, therefore, merely for convenience' sake, that the numbering of my chapters may correspond to that of his.

"The principal marks or characteristics of the true Church," says the Archbishop, in the concluding paragraph, quoting from the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Creed, "are, her Unity, Sanctity, Catholicity, and Apostolicity, to which," he continues, though without the warrant of the creed, "may be added the Infallibility of her teaching and the Perpetuity of her existence. I shall treat," he adds, "successively of these marks."

In the order of this treatment, I propose to follow him.

CHAPTER II.

THE UNITY OF THE CHURCH.

"By unity," says the Archbishop, "is meant that the members of the true Church must be united in the

belief of the same doctrines of revelation, and in the acknowledgment of the authority of the same pastors. Heresy and schism are opposed to Christian unity. By heresy, a man rejects one or more articles of the Christian faith. By schism, he spurns the authority of his spiritual superiors" (p. 21).

The Catechism of the Council of Trent puts it somewhat differently : " So vast a multitude, scattered far and wide, is called one, for the reasons mentioned by St. Paul in his epistle to the Ephesians : ' One Lord, one faith, one baptism.' This Church," it adds, " has also but one ruler and one governor, the invisible one, Christ, whom the Eternal Father ' hath made head over all the Church, which is his body ; ' " and then it goes on, in the next breath, to speak of another, a " visible " one, the " successor of Peter " (Part I., Article ix., ¶ 11, Donovan's Translation. Baltimore : John Murphy).

How there can be " but one," and that one " invisible," and yet, another, and that one " visible," is not very easy to see ; especially when taken in connection with another statement of the same catechism, to wit, that " the Church consists principally of two parts, the one called the Church triumphant, the other the Church militant ; " and that these are not two Churches, but " two constituent parts of one Church ; one part gone before, and now in the possession of its heavenly country ; the other, following every day " (Pt. I., Art. ix., ¶ 7).

Change " triumphant " to " expectant " (for the " part gone before " is not yet triumphant, and will not be till the Resurrection), and we have a true description of the one Church, with its one Head, and that Head invisible ; invisible, because, like the part of the Body which is nearest to it, it is " gone before," passed " within the veil " (Heb. 6 : 19, 20).

But is not the part that is " militant here on earth "

one? Yes! One with an organic unity; but not necessarily with a brotherly unanimity. Brothers *ought* to be brotherly; but they are not always; and yet they do not thereby cease to be brothers. The *organic* tie remains.

“Brothers are brothers evermore.”

There are manifold illustrations of the organic unity of the visible Church, each illustrating some one aspect of that unity.

The Church is one, as the Masonic fraternity is one. Now the unity of this latter is a visible unity, “known and read of all men;” and yet it has no ecumenical head, but only a national head to each national organization. Plainly, then, a visible earthly head is not necessary to the visible unity of the Visible Church. Perhaps it is on this account that the Roman Church is so *specialy* hostile to Freemasonry. She can have no liking for a society whose very existence is a standing proof of the possibility of visible ecumenical unity without a visible ecumenical head.

The Church is one, as the *race* is one. The first Adam is the head of the race; of the part that has gone before, as well as of the part still on earth; and it has no other head. The second Adam is the head of the Church; of the part still on earth, as well as of the part that has gone before; and it has no other head.

The Church is one, as the *family* is one. Though “two of us in the churchyard lie,” and the other five are parted, it may be, for all of this life, yet still “we are seven;” and these seven are one; and this one family has one head and only one; for husband and wife are one. In like manner, the Church, “the whole family in heaven and earth,” is one; and it has one Head, and only one.

But must not “the members of the true Church” be “united in the acknowledgment of the authority of

the same pastors?" They *should* be united in the acknowledgment of the same *ministry*, to wit, the Apostolic; but it is the misfortune, rather than the fault, of the many in this land, and large numbers in the motherland, that they are not. The "true Church" draws a broad line of demarcation between those who knowingly and wilfully create a schism, and those who unwittingly slide into it, or are born and reared in it. She claims as her own every baptized man and woman and child. She does not excommunicate those who by the misfortune of their birth and education are in formal but not wilful schism. She leaves that to the false parent, the stepmother, Rome. "Peter" may "begin to curse and to swear;" the Church of Christ, Catholic in truth and not in pretence, has a different way of winning back those of her children who have strayed from her fold; the way of the Mother in those beautiful lines of the Greek Anthology, so exquisitely translated by Samuel Rogers:

"While on the cliff with calm delight she kneels,
And the blue vales a thousand joys recall,
See, to the last, last verge her infant steals:
Oh fly! yet stir not, speak not, lest it fall!
Far better taught, she lays her bosom bare,
And the fond boy springs back, to nestle there."

Even the stepmother Rome can, *when it suits her purpose*, make allowance for what she calls *invincible ignorance*. Some of her children better her instructions. Said the late Bishop Wilberforce to his servant-girl, "How is it, Bridget, that you are so attached to me, and yet you believe that I shall go to hell when I die?" "Oh, I *don't* believe it." "But how am I to be saved?" "You'll be saved by your invincible ignorance." Bridget's heart was better than her head: Rome's heart is worse, I fear, than its head; and that is saying a great deal.

But must not "the members of the true Church"

be “united in the belief of the same doctrines of revelation?” So far as those doctrines are articles of faith, Yes; so far as they are outside of the faith, No. What, then, *is* the faith? The Catechism of the Council of Trent—that “Catechism which,” says the Council (Sess. 24, de Reform. c. 7), “Bishops will take care to have faithfully translated into the vernacular language, and expounded to the people by all pastors”—shall give the answer to this question, an answer which the Archbishop is estopped from finding fault with :

“Our predecessors in the faith have very wisely reduced them [viz. “the truths revealed by Almighty God”] to these four heads—The Apostles’ Creed—The Sacraments—The Ten Commandments—and The Lord’s Prayer. The Creed contains all that is to be held according to the discipline of the Christian faith, whether it regard the knowledge of God, the creation and government of the world; or the redemption of man, the rewards of the good and the punishments of the wicked. . . . The first, then, and most important points of Christian faith are those which the holy apostles, the great leaders and teachers of the faith, men inspired by the Holy Ghost, have divided into the twelve articles of the Creed : for as they had received a command from the Lord to go forth ‘into the whole world,’ as his ambassadors, and preach the Gospel to every creature (2 Cor. 5 : 18, 19, 20 ; Mark. 16 : 15), they thought proper to compose a form of Christian faith, ‘that all may speak and think the same thing’ (1 Cor. 1 : 10) ; and that amongst those whom they should have called to the unity of faith, no schisms should exist ; but that they should be perfect in the same mind, and in the same spirit. This profession of Christian faith and hope, drawn up by themselves, the Apostles called a ‘symbol,’ either because it was an aggregate of the combined sentiments of all ; or be-

cause, by it as by a common sign and watchword, they might easily distinguish false brethren, deserters from the faith 'unawares brought in' (Gal. 2 : 4), 'who adulterated the word of God' (2 Cor. 2 : 17), from those who had pledged an oath of fidelity to serve under the banner of Christ" (Preface, ¶¶ 14 and 17).

The Apostles' Creed, then (whether we accept this account of its origin or not), contains all that is necessary to be believed as a requisite to everlasting salvation. We might infer this from the fact that it is the baptismal creed, and the further fact that it is the only creed we examine the Christian on when we visit him in his last sickness and commend his parting spirit "into the hands of its faithful Creator and most merciful Saviour;" for, surely, that which is sufficient for the beginning and the end of the Christian life, is sufficient for the whole course of it. As to the Nicene Creed, the Church accepts it as a legitimate development and amplification of the teaching of the Apostles' Creed, and as such she teaches it to her children, and expects them to "grow up into it,"—an expectation which is justified by the result; but she does not impose it on them as a condition of salvation. As to the Creed of Pope Pius IV., she regards it as in no sense a development or amplification of, but rather an unsightly patch sewed on to, the old historic creed. It is not an amplification; for *to amplify* is "to place a subject in some way in a clearer light" (Andrews' "Freund's Lexicon," *sub voc.* AMPLIFICO); not to add a new subject. Neither is it a development; for what is there in the Apostles' Creed that could be developed into the supremacy of the Roman Church as the Mother and Mistress of all Churches?" He that could develop the former into the latter, or into any other of the articles of the creed of Pope Pius, could develop a beehemoth into a behemoth, or even a horse chestnut into a chestnut horse!

Nor has this patchwork development stopped here. Even within our own day, we have had two new articles tacked on to the old creed by the Roman Church. And yet the Archbishop has the assurance to tell us that "her creed is now identical with what it was in past ages" (p. 27). How does he make this out? Thus :

"But it may be asked, is not this unity of faith impaired by those doctrinal definitions which the Church has promulgated from time to time? We answer: No new dogma, unknown to the apostles, not contained in the primitive Christian revelation, can be admitted (John 14 : 26 ; 15 : 15 ; 16 : 13). For the apostles received the whole deposit of God's word, according to the promise of our Lord : 'When he shall come, the spirit of truth, he shall teach you all truth.' And so the Church proposes the doctrines of faith, such as they came from the lips of Christ, and as the Holy Spirit taught them to the apostles at the birth of the Christian law—doctrines which know neither variation nor decay.

"Hence, whenever it has been defined that any point of doctrine pertained to the Catholic faith, it was always understood that this was equivalent to the declaration that the doctrine in question had been revealed to the apostles, and had come down to us from them, either by scripture or tradition" (pp. 28, 29).

Let us hold the Archbishop to this, and see where it will land him. Within the memory of many of us, for it dates back less than a quarter of a century, "it has been defined" that the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary "pertains to the Catholic faith." It follows from the Archbishop's declaration above cited, that it always did pertain to it. It was therefore a part of "the Catholic faith" at the time of the Council of Trent. And yet, at that time, the Dominicans and

Franciscans were at swords' points upon it, and so continued to be, down almost to our own day. Why did not the infallible Pope interpose, when a word from him would have settled the controversy? Why did he leave the Church in uncertainty about it for three hundred years? This is a question that I shall defer till I come to the question of Infallibility. At present it concerns me only to ask, Where is the boasted "admirable unity that exists in matters of faith?" (p. 28). Or rather, Where *was* it, at the Council of Trent, and for a quarter of a millennium thereafter? For as, according to the Archbishop (p. 74), the Roman Church is "to-day" "more united, more compact, and more vigorous than ever she was before," it follows that before "to-day" she was less "vigorous," less "compact," less "united." How has the "admirable unity" of "to-day" been brought about? By cutting off those who, like Döllinger, profess the same faith "to-day" that they professed *yesterday*, and decline to change with the changing infallible Church. Verily, a compendious way of securing unity! Change, yourself, and then cut off those that won't change with you, and it takes no ghost to tell that those who remain will be united. But what is *such* a unity worth? Coleridge tells of a man who was "content to think with the great Dr. Paley," and to whom he retorted, "Man of sense, Dr. Paley *was* a great man; but you do not *think*, at all!" So it is with the rank and file of the Roman communion, in the matter of new-fangled articles of faith. They do not *think* at all; they let the Pope do their thinking for them, and when he changes, presto, they change with him.

But the Archbishop will have it that there is no change; only "a more explicit declaration" of what was previously "*implicitly*, less clearly, *not so earnestly* proposed," because there was then "no contrary teaching to render a more explicit declaration neces-

sary" (pp. 30, 31). He, very conveniently keeps out of sight, what, nevertheless, he well knows to be the fact, that for the greater part of the last three hundred years, there *has* been, in the matter of the Immaculate Conception, "contrary teaching" on the part of the Dominican low church, in opposition to the Franciscan high church, and therefore, on his own showing, occasion "for a more explicit declaration;" yet, till within the last quarter of a century, no such declaration forthcoming.

In pursuing this subject, the Archbishop devotes three or four pages to what may be called a sermon, on the text, "A revealed truth frequently has a very extensive scope, and is directed against error under its many changing forms. Nor is it necessary that those who receive this revelation in the first instance, should be explicitly acquainted with its full import, or cognizant of all its bearings."

A very good text, but a very inconsequent sermon; for neither of the two doctrines "defined" by the late Pope, can come under this category. Surely, if there is "occasion" now for the *explicit* belief of the Immaculate Conception, and the Infallibility of the Pope, there was equal occasion for it in the beginning. Think of a Church having an Infallible Pope at her head for eighteen hundred years, and all that time not knowing that he was infallible! Nay, allowing her children to deny his infallibility freely up to the year of grace 1870, and then for the first time excommunicating them for such denial! A man of plain practical common sense would suppose that if the Church had already got along for eighteen hundred years without *knowing* that the Pope was Infallible, she could get along another eighteen hundred years without knowing it; and further that if a doctrine so "important if true," had, to say the least, not been certainly known to be true by the Church, it could not possibly be true.

But more of this when we come to the chapter on Infallibility.

In conclusion, unity depends on historic continuity. In the words of another, "It is not because the Church is Episcopal or Presbyterian ; because it worships with or without a Liturgy ; nor for any other peculiarity of doctrine or organization, that it is said to be the Church that our Lord 'purchased with his own blood ;' 'gave himself for ;' 'that he might sanctify and cleanse it, and present it to himself without spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing.' But it is on account of identity or sameness with the Church spoken of in the Scriptures, that we can apply these things to any modern body professing to be Christians. The great point of our inquiry has been identity of origin. The same vine can never grow from several different [original] roots." ("Church Identified," by the Rev. W. D. Wilson, D.D. New York, 1850 ; pp. 238, 239.)

I have interpolated the word "original," because the Church is a *sarmentose* vine, sending out "runners" in all directions, and these runners striking root in every soil, and, when firmly rooted, retaining the common life even when severed from the parent stock. A *sect*, on the other hand, is, as the name implies, an attempt to propagate the vine by a *cutting* ; a mode of propagation for which no provision was made in the original constitution of the vine.

The writer above quoted compares the Church's history to "a stream rolling on to the ocean." His description of the stream is very graphic : "From some elevated point we may see its course through the lapse of ages. Mountains enclose it on both sides. Here a rock rising in rugged barrenness, there an island, covered with verdure and beauty, separate, for a time, its waters into several channels, each pursuing its circuitous course to a union with that from which it was separated. Perhaps the last that the eye can see will

be deltas extending their dividing influence into the very bosom of the ocean. The separation between the East and the West in the eleventh century is one such division. The Reformation is another. These may prove islands in a stream yet to be reunited ; or the river may empty itself by different mouths into eternity. But whether separate channels flowing round rock and island, or separate mouths flowing into the same ocean, the stream is one and the same. Beyond the mountains flow others that have started from other fountains, and flow in different channels. The geographer never confounds the one with the other. Their identity is never mistaken."

CHAPTER III.

THE HOLINESS OF THE CHURCH.

WITH the greater part of what the Archbishop says respecting the holiness of the Church I cordially agree ; but there are some things that cannot be permitted to pass unchallenged ; notably his estimate of the " books of piety " within his own communion, as compared with those outside of it. " Who," he asks, " can read without spiritual profit such works as the almost inspired ' Following of Christ,' by Thomas à Kempis ; the ' Christian Perfection' of Rodriguez ; the ' Spiritual Combat' of Scupoli ; the writings of St. Francis de Sales, and a countless host of other ascetical authors ?" (p. 38).

Had the Archbishop stopped here, I should have contented myself with suggesting that there was some base metal mingled with the fine gold in most of these writers, and that the asceticism in their writings might

have been somewhat lessened with advantage ; for "bodily exercise profiteth little" (1 Tim. 4 : 8).

But he goes on : " You will search in vain outside the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church for writers comparable in unction and healthy piety to such as I have mentioned."

Evidently, the Archbishop, in his " search," has never come across such works as Bishop Andrewes' " Devotions," Jeremy Taylor's " Holy Living and Dying," Bishop Wilson's " Sacra Privata," Scougal's " Life of God in the Soul of Man," " and a countless host of other" devotional, if not ascetical writers ; or else he is not a good judge of " unction," and " *healthy piety*."

He excepts one book, however, from this general disparagement ; but he does it with a salvo. " I do not speak," he says, " of the ' Book of Common Prayer,' because the best part of it is a translation from our Missal." There is a slight mistake here. The *best* part of the prayer-book, outside of what comes from holy scripture, is a translation from the early Greek Liturgies. Perhaps, however, the Archbishop thinks those Liturgies are a translation from " our Missal ;" like the honest Methodist, who, dropping in at a book-seller's in North Charles Street, Baltimore, some five-and-thirty years ago, and, while waiting his turn to be served, taking up what proved to be a prayer-book, and happening to open at the communion office, after looking at it in blank astonishment for some moments, exclaimed in unfeigned amazement, " Why, this is taken from the Discipline !"

At the opening of this chapter, the Archbishop gives the reason why the Church is called holy, to wit, because it is " a society founded by our Lord Jesus Christ for the sanctification of its members ;" an object, however, which it accomplishes but in part ; for, adds the Archbishop, " we cannot close our eyes to the

painful fact that too many of them, far from living up to the teachings of their Church, are sources of melancholy scandal" (p. 42). But this does not militate against the holiness of the Church. It is holy in *idea*, and, so far as this idea is realized in the lives of its members, they are holy, not merely in profession—which all are—but in deed and in truth.

But, says the Archbishop, "the Church, walking in the footsteps of her divine Spouse, never repudiates sinners, nor cuts them off from her fold, no matter how grievous or notorious may be their moral delinquencies; not because she connives at their sin, but because she wishes to reclaim them. She bids them never to despair, and tries, at least, to weaken their passions, if she cannot altogether reform their lives. . . .

"We know, on the other hand, that sinners who are guilty of gross crimes which shock public decency, are virtually excommunicated from Protestant communions" (p. 43).

The Archbishop refers to the parable of the *Wheat and Tares*, in justification of the course of the Roman Church as contrasted with that of "Protestant Communions." But that parable does not justify retaining in the fold "scandalous" sinners; sinners "guilty of gross crimes which shock public decency." The case of the incestuous person at Corinth is a case in point. The Corinthian Church, like the Roman of the present day, had failed to "repudiate" the sinner. Hence the apostle wrote to them (1 Cor. 5 : 2, Rhemish Version), "And you are puffed up; and have not rather mourned, that he *might be taken away from among you*, that hath done this deed." The Archbishop, however, represents the apostle as simply *reproving* the transgressor: "St. Paul," he says, "calls the Church of Corinth a congregation of saints (1 Cor. 1), though he reproves some scandalous members among them" (1 Cor. 5): "To deliver such a one to Satan for the

destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of our Lord Jesus Christ," (1 Cor. 5 : 5, Rhemish Version), that is, to cast him out of the fold, for the time being, into the world, the kingdom of Satan, "the terrible and greatest punishment," says the "annotation" of the Rhemish Version on this passage, "in the world, yea, far passing all earthly pain and torment of this life, and being a very resemblance of damnation," is, to say the least, a very singular way of "reproving" him !

The truth is, while the Roman communion goes to one extreme in this matter, and some of the Protestant communions to the other, even excluding from the fold for lack of certain "experiences," and "frames," the holy Catholic Church in this land, following the example of the apostle, excludes from communion for *scandalous* offences, and for those only.

I am glad to see that the Archbishop admits that reformation was needed three hundred years ago. "It cannot be denied," he says, "that corruption of morals prevailed in the sixteenth century to such an extent as to call for a sweeping reformation, and that laxity of discipline invaded even the sanctuary" (p. 45). If the Roman Church, all along the previous centuries had followed the example of the apostle in the case of the Corinthian Church, would the "corruption of morals" in the sixteenth century have required "a sweeping reformation?"

But how is it with the *nineteenth* century? Is there no reformation needed now? Judging from what I read in newspapers of reputation and standing, it seems to me that there is need of a very "sweeping reformation" in a part, at least, of the "holy Roman Church" in the United States of America, and that a very important part; a part dignified with the headship of a cardinal. I take the following from the *Southern Churchman* of December 19th, 1878 :

“A GRAND AFFAIR.

“The Roman Catholics have built a magnificent cathedral in the city of New York ; but some \$200,000 were needed to finish the interior and to make it ‘church-like,’ to have great marble altars and paintings and statues of the Virgin and the saints, and to purchase silk and fine linen and jewelry for the priests who were to minister at the costly altars in the costly building. But \$200,000 are not to be had for wishing, nor for that matter, in hard times, for the asking. So what do the Cardinal and other dignitaries but permit a grand fair to be held in the unfinished cathedral, a fair in which we hear there was a bar open for the sale of whiskey and ale and other drinks, and there were raffles and gambling of various kinds, so that one has a right to ask, ‘Is this temple dedicated, or to be dedicated, to God or the devil?’ for it is evident the devil’s work has been going on and in the most excited manner. But as a reporter of the *Evening Post* visited the cathedral we must permit him to tell us what he saw in one spot :

“ ‘A young priest, near what looked like a small round gambling table at the Catholic Fair yesterday, was surrounded by some bright boys, whose average age was about eight years. Some young girls swelled their number. ‘Number four,’ called out the priest, as the arrow, which had been turning on its pivot to the centre of the table, stopped over a section of the surface marked “four.” There were twelve sections in all, and on each one of them lay a cent contributed by a boy or girl. The reporter counted eighteen boys who were standing around the table shouting, snapping their eyes, watching the revolving arrow and yelling when it stopped. “Number four,” cried out the priest. “I declare, that is a lucky number. Why,

it's been 'four,' two or three times." He picked up six cents, one after the other, from the table, and handed them to the boy who had deposited a cent on number four. The remaining six cents, which lay on the other six sections of the surface of the table, he put into his pocket.

" " " "Now, who's next?" he asked with earnestness. "Who will have number four this time?" A little fellow with handsome deep black eyes and rich dark hair stretched out his hand and placed a cent on number four. Others followed him; the priest meanwhile exhorting them to do so. A pretty maid offered a cent, which he put on number twelve. "Yours is number twelve, little girl—remember, number twelve. Now I want one for number three," he said; "give me a cent for number three."

" " " "Lend me a cent," demanded a brown-haired, hot-cheeked boy of a companion who had just won six cents. "Lend me a cent, will you?" He was excited and bankrupt.

" " " "Here," said the successful player, and handed him one of the six that he held in his fist.

" " " "What's my number?" screamed a boy.

" " " "Number two, and don't forget it," replied the priest. "If it stops at that number, remember, you get six cents."

" " " "I am number five," shouted another boy.

" " "The sections were nearly full at last. Almost every section had a cent on it, and the time approached for revolving the arrow. One boy, unable to restrain himself, tried to start it.

" " " "Hold on!" yelled the priest. "Fill up. I'll do the twisting. One cent more. Remember, if you have luck you win six cents. One cent more," and he looked searchingly over the surging, tossing sea of little faces.

" " "Another boy borrowed a cent, which was quickly

put in place. The priest "twisted" the arrow. It spun around rapidly, then slowly, then very slowly, and then stopped—over number six. It wasn't "four" this time, and the face of the boy who had tried "four" on the priest's recommendation fell. But his seventeen comrades became possessed by their excitement. They crowded around the priest, tipped the table half over, almost knocked down a bust of the late Pope, and climbed upon each other's backs.

" " "Hold on, you rascals," screamed the priest, who was picking up from the table his own share of the money; "hold on, there; let me get my six; that's all I care for." When he had got his six he began the call for fresh investments, and the previous scenes were repeated.'

"Cardinal McCloskey expressed the opinion no harm was being done. So the reporter asked Father McGlynn, the pastor of St. Stephen's Roman Church, what *he* thought of it:

" "I should like to ask you one more question. When at the cathedral fair, I observed a small round table, at which a young priest stood, surrounded by a dozen or more eager boys. The table was marked off into twelve triangular sections, the apex of each triangle being at the centre of the table's surface, where was inserted a pivot, on which an arrow turned. The sections were numbered 1, 2, 3, and so on up to 12, and on each one of them lay a cent, contributed by the boys. The priest gave the arrow a rapid turn, and when it stopped he picked up six of the cents and handed them to the boy who had contributed the cent that had lain on the particular section over which the head of the arrow had stopped. The other six cents he kept for himself. I noticed that the boys were pretty eager in the sport and that the priest's exhortations to them were earnest and successful. Now, was there any harm in that?'

“ This question (says the *Independent*) was rather a poser for the casuistry of Father McGlynn ; but, on the whole, he thought that the matter involved was a ‘ question of taste,’ and, since cathedrals must be built, and the money must be obtained to build them with, and the money can’t be forced out of the people, it must be coaxed out of them, and this table, with its twelve numbers and revolving arrow, and the priest to run the machine, was one of the ways of doing the coaxing, and that ‘ the church winks at some things that confessedly are not among the most approved means of sanctification.’ The matter of fact is that this table, as rigged up and manipulated by the ‘ young priest,’ is as perfectly a gambling machine as was ever invented.

“ All this gambling, drinking, and folly done in the name of the Lord ; and done under the protection of a cardinal bishop and priests and the faithful of the one only Holy Catholic Apostolic Church !”

What is this but the murder of the moral nature of the boys ? No wonder Father Curtis in his late lecture in Baltimore, on *Things I don’t Understand*, put church fairs in that category. They are bad enough at best ; and, as generally conducted, and especially as conducted in the above-mentioned instance, ought to be abhorred of all Christian people.

But this is not all. In the *Church Journal* of January 4th, 1879, I find a communication from “ A Catholic Priest” to *The Interior*, of Chicago, from which I extract the following :

“ I have read with some interest the extract from your paper quoted and commented on by the *Catholic Review* of December 8th, and beg leave to say a few words on some of the positions of your contemporary.

“ 1. The *Catholic Review* wishes its Protestant friends to understand that, at the present moment, the new cathedral of New York does not differ from ‘any large hall, or any unfinished building within the four boundaries of America,’ or, I presume it would not hesitate to add, from any beer or rum shop within the same area. I do not know what our Protestant friends may think of the *Review’s* opinion on this matter, but I am well persuaded that the Catholic community of New York will not accept this language of this self-constituted champion. And to put this matter beyond all dispute, we have only to refer to that ancient splendid rite of the Catholic Church on the blessing and laying of the corner-stone of a church to be built. [He then goes on to describe the “rite,” as used at the laying of the corner-stone of the cathedral by Archbishop Hughes in 1854]. I am not aware that large halls or other buildings intended for profane uses have such blessings invoked upon them. . . .

“ 2. The *Interior* has charged, and the *Catholic Review* has not denied, that ‘beer, ale, wine, whiskey, gin, and all kinds of liquors were sold and drunk’ in the new cathedral of New York during the fair. The *Review* affects to believe that it is only ‘foolish, canting, hypocritical Puritanism’ that has declared itself scandalized by the sale of these beverages at the late fair; but I must be permitted to tell the *Review* that large numbers of Catholic Christians, both lay and clerical, remembering the sublime language of the Roman pontifical by which the ‘place’ of the new cathedral was set apart forever to God, and the cross—the *signum salutis*—set up, and the corner-stone blessed and laid in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, have been greatly shocked, not to say grossly scandalized, at witnessing ‘the place destined’ for God’s service turned into a vulgar bar-room, dealing out to all comers ‘beer, ale, wine, whiskey, gin, and all kinds of

liquors.' . . . The example of those six weeks is enough to put back the cause of temperance in New York—I may say in the whole United States—for ten years. . . . Even though the late fair were held in a profane place or building, I still hold that the Church authorities should not have listened to the least suggestion looking to the sale and use of intoxicating drinks for the furtherance of this object. Such a tolerance on their part would be offensive to pious ears; how much more so when the bar occupied the place of the 'sign of salvation'? . . .
 . . . "I regret exceedingly to be obliged to speak with such plainness on this painful subject, and I call the attention of the Catholic body to it solely in the fondest hope that the like example will never again be set in New York, or in any diocese of these United States—an example which, notwithstanding the good disposition of the people of New York, has greatly shocked their religious sense, and lessened the respect for the Catholic religion which its venerable history and magnificent edifices are well calculated to inspire."

The significance of all this is that the course of procedure above described has been resorted to with the sanction of a Cardinal-Archbishop, the highest dignitary of the Roman Church in this land, and for the completion of his own cathedral. It reminds one of the means resorted to by Pope Leo X. for the completion of St. Peter's, a subject on which I may have something to say when I come to the chapter on Indulgences.

"A gentleman informed me," says the Archbishop—and he might, I think, more creditably to himself, unless he could have given particulars, have left it unsaid—"that he never saw a poor person enter an Episcopal Church which was contiguous to his residence" (p. 43).

Who was the gentleman, and where was his resi-

dence ? Give us chapter and verse. The Episcopal Church has, in common with many of its neighbors, besides its other sins, that of the unchristian pew-system to answer for ; but she has never, that I am aware of, gone so far as to have not only pews but also *locks on the doors of those pews*, as has, or had a few years ago, and I presume has still, the Archbishop's own cathedral !* “They that live in glass houses”—and so forth.

But to come back from the Archbishop's digression to the subject of his chapter, and to conclude my remarks on it.

While the Roman Church “never repudiates sinners, nor cuts them off from her fold, no matter how grievous or notorious may be their *moral* delinquencies,” any delinquency in what she calls the *faith*, any rejection of, or hesitation about, her patchwork additions to the creed, is visited with speedy excision from her fold. To controvert, in this latter half of the nineteenth century, a dogma that might have been, and actually was, freely controverted throughout the seventeenth and eighteenth, is, in her estimation, worse than the grossest and most notorious moral delinquencies !

CHAPTER IV.

CATHOLICITY.

‘THE word *Catholic*, or Universal,’ says the Archbishop, “signifies that the true Church is not circumscribed in its extent, like human empires, nor confined to one race of people, like the Jewish Church, but that

* The pews in Cardinal McCloskey's new Cathedral are under lock and key.

she is diffused over every nation of the globe, and counts her children among all tribes and peoples and tongues of the earth."

Stop with the word "globe," in the above, and change "diffused" into *diffusible*, and the definition will be correct; what follows is out of place in a definition. The actual local extent of a Church at any particular moment of time has nothing whatever to do with the legitimacy of its claim to be "the Catholic Church." Was the Church of Christ any the less "the Catholic Church" of the creed before the day of Pentecost, than after it; any the less "the Catholic Church" before St. Peter admitted Cornelius and his household into it, than after their admission; any the less "the Catholic Church" before the "wonderful conversion" of St. Peter, than after that conversion, and the wonderful results that followed thereupon, even to the ends of the earth? If so, how comes it that according to the Archbishop's "tabular statement," on page 65, the "Catholic Church" had, for its "Place of Origin," "Jerusalem," for its "Founder," "Jesus Christ," and for its "Year," "thirty-three?"

When the "Arian schism" (p. 73), "soon after its rise, spread rapidly through Europe, Northern Africa, and portions of Asia": When "it received the support of immense multitudes, and flourished for awhile under the fostering care of several successive emperors": When "Catholic bishops were banished from their sees, and their places were filled by Arian intruders": When "the Church which survived the sword of Paganism seemed for awhile to yield to the poison of Arianism": When, in short, it was *Athanasius contra mundum*—did the all but universal defection make what remained any the less, in the Archbishop's estimation, "the Catholic Church" of the creed?

When "the faith was lost in Sweden" (p. 74),

“through the influence of its king, Gustavus Vasa”—When “Denmark conformed to the new creed through the intrigues of King Christian II”—when “Catholicity was also crushed out in Norway, England, and Scotland”—when, in short, “Ireland alone, of all the nations of Northern Europe, remained faithful to the ancient Church”—was what was left, after these wholesale defections, any the less, in the Archbishop’s estimation, “the Catholic Church” of the creed, on account of them?

And if all the nations of the earth, except Spain, were to revolt against the Pope, and every individual in those nations were to refuse allegiance to him, and the Pope himself were to remove his See from Rome to Madrid, as John XXII. removed his from Rome to Avignon, and as St. Peter is *said* to have removed his from Antioch to Rome, would the Church in Spain be, any the less, in the Archbishop’s estimation, “the Catholic Church” of the creed?

And if not, if, on the contrary, the exigencies of the Archbishop’s position would compel him to answer all, or any, of these question in the negative, why does he *lug* into the definition of “Catholic,” as employed in the creed, an *actual* local universality, that has no business to be there?

And if, in the contingency last supposed, the Pope were to summon the Spanish prelates to meet in council at Madrid, and they were to respond to the summons, would the council thus assembled be any the less in the Archbishop’s estimation, an Ecumenical Council, than the late “Council of the Vatican?” And if not, why does he parade the numerosity and *poly-ethnicity* of this latter council? Is he not well aware that the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381, which accepted and enlarged the Nicene Creed, and which is universally acknowledged to have been an Ecumenical Council, was composed of one hundred and fifty Orien-

tal bishops, with not a single Western bishop or representative of a Western bishop among its members? Really, it is time to have done with such clap-trap.

And what but clap-trap is that story (p. 55) of "European emigrants" from "sunny Italy," who found themselves at home in the "Cathedral" at Richmond? Where *should* a Roman in religion find himself at home but in a Roman Church? Would not a Chinaman, landing in San Francisco find himself at home in the first joss-house he chanced to enter? Would not "a number of" Russian "emigrants" arriving in New York, find themselves at home in the Greek Church under Father Bjerring? And Father Bjerring is a welcome guest; while the Cardinal-Archbishop in New York, and his brother Metropolitan in Baltimore, are ecclesiastical intruders. The Roman Church has no mission to preach the creed of Pope Pius anywhere. Tridentine Romanism is an intrusion even in Rome itself.

"That the Roman Catholic Church alone deserves the name of *Catholic*," says the Archbishop, "is so evident, that it is ridiculous to deny it" (p. 51). And yet he devotes eight pages to the proof of it! Surely, if it is ridiculous to deny it, it is equally ridiculous to attempt to prove it. Think of a high dignitary, for want of earnest occupation, gravely setting himself to prove what it is ridiculous to deny!!! And the proofs, themselves! Let us look at a specimen or two.

"Ours is the only Church which adopts the name as her official title."

Is this so? The creed of Pope Pius begins: "I, N., believe and profess with a firm faith each and all of the articles contained in the creed which the *holy Roman Church* adopts—to wit:" Surely, this looks very like the "official title." But, granting the Archbishop's claim, what follows? The Baptist Church is the only Church which adopts "Baptist" as her official title:

is she therefore the only Church that baptizes? The Winebrennerian Church, whose *habitat* is in central Pennsylvania and western Maryland, is the only Church which adopts "The Church of God" as her official title: is she, therefore, the Church of God; and the only Church of God? But, "We have possession, which is nine-tenths of the law." Well! and haven't the Baptists and the Winebrennerians, possession?"

"Should a stranger ask one of them to direct him to the Catholic Church, they [he?] would instinctively point out to him the Roman Catholic Church" (p. 52).

Well! and if the same stranger, going into a New England village, were to ask the first person he met to direct him to the Orthodox Church, he would infallibly, if not "instinctively," point out to him the Trinitarian Congregational Church. Is that Church, therefore, orthodox; and the only orthodox Church?

And this is what the Archbishop expects to pass for argument!* I commend to his consideration a saying of Coleridge: "A philosopher's scientific language, compared with his ordinary language, is as his astronomical clock, compared with his watch; he sets the latter by the town clock, or the Dutch clock in his kitchen; not because it is right, but because his neighbors, or his cook, go by it."—*Quoted from memory.*

"If they" (the *Protestant Episcopalians*) "think that they have any just claim to the name of *Catholic*, why not come out openly and write it on the title-pages of their Bibles and prayer-books?"

* If I ask an Irishman, "Are you a Republican?" and he answers, "No, I am a Democrat;" have I a right to say that, by his own confession, he is not a Republican in the sense in which the word is used in Article iv., section 4, of the Constitution of the United States? Just as little have I a right to say of an American who, to the question, "Are you a Catholic?" answers, "No, I am a Protestant," that, by his own confession, he is not a Catholic in the sense in which the word is used in the Apostles' creed. The Archbishop's argument from the popular use of the word *Catholic*, is ineffably silly. Of course, *he* sees through it, but he thinks his readers won't; else he wouldn't use it.

When the Roman authorities will “come out openly and write it on the title-pages of *their* Bibles” and Missals and Breviaries, I will answer that question. At present, I content myself with the remark that I have lying before me the Breviary in Latin, with the imprint, BELLOVACI, and that the title is *Breviarium Romanum*; and the Missal, translated into English by Bishop England, and that the title is “The Roman Missal;” and that in the title-page of neither of them, nor in that of any copy of the Douay Bible, or of the Rhemish Testament, that has fallen under my observation, does the word *Catholic* occur.

I remark, in conclusion of this chapter, the Church of the Creed and of the Bible is Catholic, as the Masonic fraternity is Catholic; that is to say, it is not for one nation, but for all nations. A Mason anywhere is a Mason everywhere, and is received as such. A Catholic anywhere is a Catholic everywhere. Time was when he was received as such; if he is not so now, it is the fault of the bishop of Rome, and he must answer for it. “Where is the flock that was given thee, thy beautiful flock? What wilt thou say when he shall punish thee?”*

CHAPTER V.

APOSTOLICITY.

THE Archbishop opens his chapter on Apostolicity with a statement that has no foundation in fact, to wit, that “in the creed framed in the first Ecumenical Council of Nicæa, in the year 325, we find these words: ‘I believe in the One, Holy, Catholic, *Apostolic*

* Jer. 13 : 20, 21.

Church.' " It simply *is not true* that in the creed framed by that council, in that year, we find these words, or any words like them. The creed in question ends with the words, " And in the Holy Ghost." All that follows (except the *filioque*, "and the Son") was added by the Council of Constantinople, fifty-six years later. Had the Archbishop said, " in the Nicene Creed," I should not have called attention to the inaccuracy, because that is very commonly called (for *brevity's* sake) the Nicene Creed, which is more correctly designated as the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan. But the Archbishop is not consulting *brevity*. On the contrary, he is ushering in a formal quotation, with all the "pomp and circumstance" of authority. His statement is that the creed *with the words in question in it* was framed at Nicæa, in 325 ; and this statement, like a good many other statements of his, in this and subsequent chapters, has no foundation in fact. It is true the inaccuracy is of no importance as respects the subject of this chapter ; but it is of the highest importance as respects the trustworthiness of the Archbishop, for it is part and parcel of an habitual, if not systematic, looseness and inaccuracy and (in more than one instance) worse than inaccuracy of statement or citation.

The Archbishop rightly holds that the " holy Catholic Church" of the Creed must be Apostolic in Doctrine and Ministry; and he claims this Apostolicity exclusively for the Roman Church. He gives a list, in "parallel lines" (he means *columns*), of ten points of doctrine in which what he calls the " Catholic Church" agrees with, and what he calls " Protestant Churches" differ from, the " Apostolic Church ;" but as every one of these (except the fourth, which refers to women preaching, and which, therefore, I am not concerned with) is treated by him more or less at large, in subsequent chapters, I shall consider them when I come to those chapters. At present, I confine myself to his claim

of Apostolicity in Ministry as belonging to the Roman Church, and not belonging to the Anglican.

"The Anglican or Episcopal Church," he says (p. 62), "owes its origin to Henry VIII. of England. The immediate cause of his renunciation of the Roman Church [mark that; the Archbishop himself says, "of the Roman Church;" not, of the Catholic Church] was the refusal of Pope Clement VII. to grant him a divorce." This is simply not true; for Lingard, the Archbishop's own historian (the "Abridged Library Edition" of whose "History of England" is advertised by "Murphy & Co." on the fly-leaf of the Archbishop's book, under the head of "Standard Catholic Books)," says, in the history itself (Henry VIII., Chapter III., 1534, March 23d, on which day the decision in the case, which had been pending before Clement since December 16th, 1527, was reached), that "the kingdom was severed by legislative authority from the communion of Rome [observe, he does not say, from the Catholic Church], long before the judgment given by Clement could have reached the knowledge of Henry." And he states in a foot-note that the royal assent to this legislative act was given March 30th, and adds: "It was not possible that a transaction in Rome on the 23d could induce the king to give his assent on the 30th." I quote from the "new edition, as enlarged by Dr. Lingard shortly before his death." What could induce the Archbishop so recklessly to falsify history? But more of this when we come to the chapter on Matrimony, where it is again introduced, and where it properly belongs.

I turn to the other assertion of the Archbishop, to wit, that the Anglican Church "owes its origin to Henry VIII." For this, he quotes D'Aubigné (who, however, as quoted, merely says, "there is a close relationship between these two divorces," viz., that of England from the Pope, and that of Henry from Catherine), and "Bishop Short, an Anglican histo-

rian," who says (§ 201), "the existence of the Church of England as a distinct body, and her final separation from Rome, may be dated from the period of the divorce." But the Archbishop himself must admit that Bishop Short's statement is not true; for the "*final separation*" did not take place till after the death of "Bloody Mary."

But what does the Bishop mean by "distinct?" Evidently, *independent*; for, that the Church of England was all along a distinct body in the same sense in which the Gallican Church, and the Spanish Church, were distinct bodies, the whole course of the history shows; and he says expressly (§ 51), "It will not perhaps be necessary to say much of the steps by which the erroneous doctrines of the Church of Rome gradually over-spread *that of England*;" and again (§ 119), (speaking of the assertion of Wiclif, "that the elements did after consecration continue to possess their original natures of bread and wine"), "The decree with which this delivery of his opinion was followed in Oxford (Lewis, 319; Wilk. Cons., iii.: 170), is probably the first formal determination of the *Church of England* in the case."

So, then, even in the opinion of Bishop Short, so far back as the time of Wiclif, more than a hundred and fifty years before the divorce of Henry VIII., the Church of England was in existence as a body "distinct" enough to make "a formal determination" on so important a subject as transubstantiation. It was not, therefore *created* by Henry VIII. It was the same old Church in his day that it was in Wiclif's, only older by a century and a half; and it *continued* the same through the reign of Edward into that of "Bloody Mary," Cardinal Pole himself being witness. "In consequence of a royal message," says Lingard (Mary, Chapter II., 1554; November 28th), "the lords and commons repaired to the court; and, after a few words from the chancellor, Pole, in a long harangue, returned

them thanks for the act which they had passed in his favor, exhorted them to repeal, in like manner, all the statutes enacted in derogation of the papal authority, and assured them of every facility on his part to effect *the reunion of the Church of England with that of Rome*. The chancellor, having first taken the orders of the king and queen, replied that the two houses would deliberate apart, and signify their determination on the following morning.

“The motion for the *reunion* was carried almost by acclamation ;” and “on the following day” complete absolution for the past was given by the cardinal, and a “Te Deum was chanted in thanksgiving for the event.” For this, Lingard gives, as his authorities, “Poli, Ep. v. App. 315-318; Foxe, 91; Journal of Commons, 38.”

The Church of England, then, having been the same under Henry VIII. that it had been all along, and having preserved its continuity, through the reign of Edward, under the primacy of Cranmer, and through the reign of Mary under the primacy of Cardinal Pole, did it preserve that continuity under Elizabeth, and has it preserved it down to our day? Rome *practically* says, No! But she has never ventured to commit herself to a formal declaration upon it. The whole question turns on the validity of the consecration of Archbishop Parker, the successor of Cardinal Pole. The following account is from Lingard himself; it will be found in the note at the end of vol. vii., pp. 293, 294, “First American,” from the last London edition. Philadelphia: Eugene Cummiskey, 1827:

“The facts that are really known are the following: The Queen, from the beginning of her reign, had designed Parker for the archbishopric. After a long resistance he gave his consent: and a *congé d’elire* was issued to the dean and chapter, July 18th, 1559. He was chosen August 1st. On September 9th the

queen sent her mandate to Tunstal, Bishop of Durham, Bourne of Bath and Wells, Pool of Peterborough, Kitchin of Llandaff, Barlow, the deprived bishop of Bath under Mary, and Scory of Chichester, also deprived under Mary, to confirm and consecrate the archbishop elect. (Rym. xv., 541.) Kitchin had conformed; and it was hoped that the other three, who had not been present in Parliament, might be induced to imitate his example. All these, however, refused to officiate; and in consequence the oath of supremacy was tendered to them (Rym. xv., 545); and their refusal to take it was followed by deprivation. In these circumstances no consecration took place; but three months later (December 6th), the queen sent a second mandate, directed to Kitchin, Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, the deprived Bishop of Exeter under Mary; John, Suffragan of Bedford; John, Suffragan of Thetford, and Bale, Bishop of Ossory, ordering them, or any four of them to confirm and consecrate the archbishop elect; but with an additional clause, by which she, of her supreme royal authority, supplied whatever deficiency there might be according to the statutes of the realm, or the laws of the Church, either in the acts done by them, or in the person, state, or faculty of any of them, such being the necessity of the case and the urgency of the time. (Rym. xv., 549). Kitchin again appears to have declined the office. But Barlow, Scory, Coverdale, and Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, confirmed the election on the 9th; and consecrated Parker on the 17th. The ceremony was performed, though with a little variation, according to the ordinal of Edward VI. Two of the consecrators, Barlow and Hodgkins, had been ordained bishops according to the Roman pontifical, the other two according to the Reformed Ordinal. (Wilk. Con. iv. 198.) Of this consecration on the 17th of December, there can be no doubt."

In a subsequent edition, the one I have already quoted from, and which contains the author's latest revision, there is a long note of over six closely-printed pages, in the Appendix, taking the same ground, and answering objections. One objection was that the official register, containing a full account of the consecration, was a forgery. "But there was nothing," says Lingard, "to countenance such a supposition. The most experienced eye could not discover in the entry itself, or the form of the characters, or the color of the ink, the slightest vestige of imposture." And "if external confirmation were wanting, there was the archbishop's diary," and "the Zurich letters, in which we find Sampson informing Peter Martyr" of the consecration.

Another objection was, that, according to the register, Barlow was the "consecrating prelate," and that, though he had been elected bishop, while on a mission in Scotland, in the reign of Henry VIII., there was no record of *his* consecration. "Still," says Lingard, "the absence of proof [of consecration] is no proof of non-consecration. No man has ever disputed the consecration of Gardiner of Winchester; yet he was made bishop while on a mission abroad, and his consecration is involved in as much darkness as that of Barlow. When, therefore, we find Barlow during ten years, the remainder of Henry's reign, constantly associated as a brother with the other consecrated bishops, summoned equally with them to parliament and convocation, taking his seat among them according to his seniority, and voting on all subjects as one of them, it seems most unreasonable to suppose without direct proof, that he had never received that sacred rite, without which, according to the laws of both Church and State, he could not have become a member of the Episcopal body." See Appendix A.

Another objection was that Parker's consecration

was "illegal, through the defect of jurisdiction in his consecrators, and the illegality of the ordinal according to which he had been consecrated." In regard to this, Lingard, in the body of his work (Elizabeth, Chap. IV., 1559; August 1st), says: "By the revival of the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII., it was made necessary, that the election of the archbishop should be confirmed,* and his consecration be performed by four bishops [in possession of Sees]. But how were four bishops to be found, when by the deprivation of the Catholic prelates† there remained in the kingdom but one lawful bishop [*i. e.*, bishop in possession of a See], he of Landaff? Again, the use of the ordinal of Edward VI. had been abolished by Parliament in the last reign, that of the Catholic [Roman] ordinal by Parliament in the present; in what manner then was Parker to be consecrated, when there existed no form of consecration recognized by law? Six theologians and canonists were consulted, who returned an opinion that in a case of such urgent necessity, the queen possessed the power of supplying every defect through the plentitude of her ecclesiastical authority, as head of the Church. In conformity with this answer a commission with a sanatory clause was issued (Rym. XV. : 549); and four of the commissioners, Barlowe, the deprived Bishop of Bath, and Hodgkins, once suffragan of Bedford, who had both been consecrated according to the Catholic pontifical, and Scory, the deprived Bishop of Chichester, and Coverdale the deprived Bishop of Exeter, who had both been consecrated according to the reformed ordinal, proceeded to confirm the election of Parker and then to consecrate him after the form adopted toward the close of the reign of Edward VI."

* Prior to the rupture of Henry with Rome, elections of Bishops had to be confirmed by the Pope.

† They had been deprived for refusing to take the oath of supremacy. Kitchin, of Landaff, took the oath and retained his Sec.

What the queen undertook to do by the "sanatory clause" was to suspend, for the particular occasion, the operation of two acts of Parliament, that of the twenty-fifth of Henry VIII. above mentioned, and that under Mary, abolishing the reformed ordinal. In doing this, she usurped the authority not as has been alleged, "of Almighty God," but of Parliament, whose function clearly it is to suspend former acts of Parliament. For this act she was responsible to Parliament, and Parliament subsequently, as admitted by Lingard in the fourth paragraph of the long note before mentioned, condoned and validated it.

There is but one other objection mentioned in the note of Lingard, and in this he seems to think there is some force; the objection, namely, that whereas in the present office for the consecration of a Bishop in the Church of England (which, however, dates back only to the time of Charles II.) the *form* at the laying on of hands runs, "Receive the Holy Ghost, *for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands.* In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. And remember that thou stir up," etc., the part in *italics* was not in the ordinal of Edward, by which Parker was consecrated, and that therefore the consecration was invalid, as not specifying the office to which he was consecrated.

To this I answer, first, that the office is specified in other parts of the service, particularly in the *presentation* of the candidate, which was in these words: "Rev. Father in God, we offer and present unto you this pious and learned man, to be consecrated archbishop."*

* See the whole account of the Consecration, in the original Latin of the *Lambeth Register*, in the *Appendix* to Haddan's "Apostolical Succession." I add, Bishop and Archbishop are the same *Order*, and therefore require but one consecration. When one already a Bishop is made Archbishop, he is not consecrated again, either in the English, or in the Roman Church. But Parker was not bishop, but only priest.

I answer, second, that if the lack of specification of office in the *form* is fatal to the consecration of Parker, then it is equally fatal to that of the Roman Bishops; for neither is there any specification of office in the *form* in the Roman Pontifical: it is simply, *Accipe spiritum sanctum*, "Take the Holy Ghost," the very words of Edward's ordinal; and then follows the prayer, *Be propitious*, etc. But, say the advocates of Rome, a man must be a Priest before he can be made a Bishop, and the *form* for ordaining Priests in Edward's ordinal is insufficient, because it does not contain the words, "Receive the power to offer sacrifice to God, and to celebrate masses for the quick and dead." I answer, first, Neither does the *form* by which St. Peter was ordained; for it and the *form* of Edward's Ordinal are identical. They both run, *Receive the Holy Ghost; Whose sins*, etc. I answer, second, Parker was "chaplain to Anne Boleyn" (Lingard, Elizabeth, Chap. IV., 1559, August 1st), and was therefore ordained Priest by the Roman *form*, the only one in use under Henry VIII.

But, it is said, the consecration was invalid for want of the Papal sanction. If so, the consecrations of the Bishops of the Greek Church are invalid. But Rome admits their validity.

But, says the Archbishop, "the very name you bear, betrays your recent birth; for who ever heard of a Baptist or an Episcopal, or any other Protestant church, prior to the Reformation?"

The Church of *our* Fathers bears the same name now that it bore hundreds of years before the Reformation, and has *continued* to bear ever since, to wit, the *Church of England*. Dupin, the famous "Doctor of Sorbonne, and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris," nearly two hundred years ago, opens the seventh chapter, Century XI., of his "Compendious History of the Church" with the question, "In what state was the *Church*

of *England*, and what passed there in the eleventh century?" And more than six hundred and fifty years ago, to wit, A.D. 1215, it was officially so designated; for the very first article of "Magna Charta" (see Jacob's Law Dictionary) reads: "The Church of England shall be free, and all ecclesiastical persons enjoy their rights and privileges." It was the *Church of England* then, and it is the *Church of England* now; it was "free" then; it is "free" now. The "Episcopal" Church in the United States is its legitimate offspring, recognized by it as such. Its *name* of "Episcopal," therefore, does not "*betray*" its "recent birth;" nor is that birth "recent" in any other sense than that in which the birth of every Church, the Roman itself not excepted, in a recently discovered country is recent.

"The Catholic Church [meaning the Roman], on the contrary, can easily vindicate the title of Apostolic, because she derives her origin from the Apostles. Every Priest and Bishop can trace his genealogy to the first disciples of Christ with as much facility as the most remote branch of a vine can be traced to the main stem" (p. 67).

So far as this is true (for it is *not* true that it can be done with as much *facility*), it is equally true of the Anglican Church.

"There is not a link wanting in the chain which binds the humblest Priest in the land to the Prince of the Apostles" (p. 67).

That is more than the Archbishop or any other man *knows*, even be he infallible pope; but then it is more than he *needs* to know, to make out the ecclesiastical descent of the Priest from the Apostle. For, in the first place, we know that St. Paul said to St. Timothy (2 Tim. 2 : 2), "The things that thou hast heard of me among many witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful men, who shall be able to teach others also." And

we believe that St. Timothy, being himself a "faithful man," *did* commit the same to other "faithful men;" and these, being themselves "faithful men," did, for the same reason, commit the same to other "faithful men;" and they to others; and so on, down to our day. If not, why not? When and where was there any break in the transmission? "*Oh, somewhere, in the dark ages?*" And what was the characteristic of those dark ages? "*Why, men were great sticklers for the outward in religion, to the disparagement of the inward.*" So then the break in the outward took place, according to these objectors, at the very time when men were the greatest sticklers for the outward! Not very likely. At any rate, it is mere conjecture on their part. Not one of them has ever been able to put his finger on a broken link, and say, Here it is! The advocates of Rome have, indeed, professed to think they have found one in Archbishop Parker. Some of them may have been *innocent* enough really to think it. If so, they are fit companions (*teste* Lingard) for Mark Twain's "Innocents Abroad."

In the second place, the provision in the early Church for guarding against the introduction of unworthy persons into the Ministry, has also effectually guarded against any danger to the *Succession*, by a broken link, here and there, if any such there have been; the provision, namely, requiring a Bishop to be consecrated by at least three Bishops—"at all events, two" (Council of Nice, Canon 4)—a provision that has been, with rare exceptions, scrupulously kept to. The consecration of Archbishop Carroll, the first Bishop of the Roman communion in the United States, was one of these exceptions. He was consecrated by only one Bishop. His consecration, however, was as *valid*, though not as regular, as if it had been performed by three. All the Bishops of the Anglican Communion in the United States have been consecrated by three or

more Bishops. The first, Bishop Seabury, was consecrated in Aberdeen, November 14th, 1784, by the Bishops of Aberdeen and Ross and Moray. The next two, Bishops White and Provost, were consecrated in Lambeth Chapel, February 4th, 1787, by the Archbishops of Canterbury, and York, and the Bishops of Bath and Wells, and Peterborough; and the fourth, Bishop Madison, at the same place, September 19th, 1790, by the Archbishop of Canterbury and two other English Bishops. By these four the fifth, Bishop Claggett of Maryland, was consecrated in Trinity Church, New York, September 17th, 1792. And thus was begun the line of American Consecrations, which has been kept up ever since, and, by the grace of God, ever shall be, to the end of time. The present Bishop of Maryland had four Bishops to consecrate him; three of these had each three consecrators, and the other had four; so that, going back only two steps, if the same Bishop had not, in some instances, taken part in more than one of these consecrations, the Bishop of Maryland would have traced his succession through thirteen Bishops; as a matter of fact, he traces it through ten, any one of whom being a validly consecrated Bishop, *his* consecration is valid. And as the number increases (except so far as modified by the same Bishop having part in more than one consecration) in geometrical progression at every step, going back step by step, we shall find at the tenth step at least a thousand Bishops, every one of whose consecrations must have been invalid, to invalidate his: by such a *concatenation* (not by a single chain) does he go back to "the Prince of the Apostles." If "a three-fold cord is not easily broken," how must it be with a three-times-three-fold, a three-times-three-times-three-fold, and so on?

The concatenation by which the two extremes are connected may be illustrated by comparing it to a shawl of network suspended by one of its corners. You

may cut a hundred meshes, here and there, and still the connection of the lower corner with the upper will remain ; to sever it, you must cut in some one direction, entirely across the network.

The upper corner may represent St. Peter, or St. Paul, or any other of the Apostles ; the lower corner any Bishop of the present day ; the intermediate meshes, or rather intersections of meshes, the intermediate Bishops through whom the succession is claimed to have been transmitted. You may sever a hundred meshes in the middle portion of the network, representing the Bishops of the middle or dark ages, and still the connection of the Bishops of the present day with the Apostles remains intact.

“ And although on a few occasions there happened to be two or even three claimants for the chair of Peter, these counter-claims could no more affect the validity of the legitimate Pope than the struggle of two contestants for a seat in Congress could invalidate the title of the lawful representative” (pp. 67, 68).

Very true. But how was it to be decided who *was* the “ legitimate Pope ?” For, as only the “ legitimate Pope” is infallible, the decision between the rival claimants must be infallible, and therefore must be made by an infallible tribunal. But more of this when we come to the chapter on Infallibility.

The two remaining paragraphs will be considered when we come to the chapter on the Supremacy, where they properly belong.

I have confined myself, as I proposed in the outset of my remarks on this chapter, to Apostolicity in Ministry, because the question of Apostolicity in Doctrine is involved in the several doctrines claimed by the Archbishop to be Apostolic, and which will come up for consideration in my remarks on the several chapters in which they are treated. I will therefore merely remark here that the Church of England has the same

Creeds now that she had, and that Rome had, before the separation ; neither more nor fewer ; and that if Rome has more now, it is because she has added, *since then*, the twelve articles of Pope Pius IV., and the two of Pope Pius IX.

CHAPTER VI.

PERPETUITY OF THE CHURCH.

THE Archbishop, wiser (at least in his own estimation) than the Creed, puts Perpetuity among the "shining marks" for "distinguishing between the true Church and false sects" (p. 21). But *how* it is to distinguish between them, I cannot see. Doubtless the Catholic Church is to be perpetual ; but it does not follow that every part of it is to be perpetual. The seven Apocalyptic Churches were parts of the Catholic Church, yet their "candlestick" has been removed "out of his place." The Church of St. Cyprian and St. Augustine was a part of the Catholic Church, yet it has long since ceased to be. And so the Roman Church (which is only a part, even in her own estimation, of the Catholic Church, else she could not be, as she claims to be, in the Creed of Pope Pius, "the Mother and Mistress of all Churches," since, in that case, there would be no other Churches for her to be Mother and Mistress of) may cease to be, and yet the perpetuity of the *Catholic* Church remain intact.* On the other hand, the Greek Church, which the Archbishop looks upon as a "false sect," is at least the equal thus far, in the matter of perpetuity, of what he calls the Catholic Church, but what might with more propriety be called the Tridentine, and bids fair to outlast it. For what he quotes De Maistre as saying of Protestantism

(p. 75), may with at least equal truth, be said of Tridentinism, "it must subsist until it perishes, just as an ulcer disappears with the last atom of the flesh which it has been eating away. (*Du Pape*, l. 2, c. 5.)"

There is a "plentiful lack" of logic, or even the semblance of logic, in this part of the Archbishop's "little book," notwithstanding the chapter extends through thirteen pages. He must have put Perpetuity among the "shining marks of the Church," to give himself the opportunity of "airing his rhetoric." I have no ambition to take the wind out of his sails. He is evidently bound for "Cowes and a market." He might have spared himself the risk of that venture. The only market for such merchandise is at Rome.

CHAPTER VII.

INFALLIBLE AUTHORITY OF THE CHURCH.

ANOTHER "shining mark" of the Church, though not contained in the creed, is, according to the Archbishop, her "Infallible Authority."

"That the Church was infallible in the Apostolic age, is denied by no Christian. We never question the truth of the Apostles' declarations; they were, in fact, the only authority in the Church for the first century. The New Testament was not completed till the close of the first century. There is no just ground for denying to the Apostolic teachers of the nineteenth century in which we live, a prerogative clearly possessed by those of the first, especially as the divine Word nowhere intimates that this unerring guidance was to die with the Apostles" (p. 83).

There is an unmistakable "intimation" in St. John, 14 : 25, 26, that *this* guidance was "to die with" them :

“ These things have I spoken unto you, being yet present with you. But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, *and bring all things to your remembrance, whatsoever I have said unto you.*” The part I have *italicized*, confines the promise to the Apostles ; it is physically impossible that it should be fulfilled to their successors. The Archbishop himself admits, further on, that it was confined to them : “ The infallibility of the Popes does not signify that they are inspired. The Apostles were endowed with the gift of inspiration, and we accept their writings as the revealed word of God.

“ No Catholic, on the contrary, claims that the Pope is inspired, or endowed with divine revelation properly so called” (pp. 140, 141).

And in the preceding chapter :

“ Peter, it is true, besides the prerogatives inherent in his office, possessed also the power of working miracles, and the gift of inspiration. These two latter gifts are not claimed by the Pope, as they were personal to Peter, and by no means essential to the government of the Church. God acts toward his Church as we deal with a tender sapling. When we first plant it, we water it, and soften the clay about its roots. But when it takes deep root, we leave it to the care of Nature’s laws. In like manner, when Christ first planted His Church, He nourished its infancy by miraculous agency ; but when it grew to be a tree of fair proportions, He left it to be governed by the general laws of his Providence” (pp. 128, 129).

Exactly so ! And Infallibility is *not* embraced in “ the general laws of his Providence.” On the contrary, those laws commit the child, in infancy, to the teaching of the mother, and she is admitted to be fallible ; and afterward to the teaching of the Pastor and his subordinates, and he also is admitted to be fallible ;

and, once a year, or so, to the teaching of the Bishop or Archbishop, and even he is admitted to be fallible. There the learner stops, not one in a thousand ever seeing, let alone hearing, the infallible Pope, or having need to see him or hear him.

What the Archbishop says in the last of the above-quoted paragraphs is a complete answer to the argument involved in his allegation that "God loves us as much as he loved the primitive Christians; Christ died for us as well as for them; and we have as much need of unerring teachers as they had" (p. 83).

But, says the Archbishop, quoting such passages as, "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations," "He that heareth you, heareth me," etc., "From these passages, we see, on the one hand, that the Apostles and their successors have received full powers to announce the Gospel; and on the other, that their hearers are obliged to listen with docility, and to obey not merely by an external compliance, but also by an internal assent of the intellect. If, therefore, the Catholic Church could preach error, would not God Himself be responsible for the error? And could not the faithful soul say to God with all reverence and truth: "Thou hast commanded me, O Lord, to hear Thy Church. If I am deceived by obeying her, Thou art the cause of my error" (p. 86).

The Archbishop shall answer himself: "They"—the priests under the Old Testament—"were the depositaries of God's law, and were its expounders to the people. 'The lips of the priest (Mal. 2:7) shall keep knowledge, and they (the people) shall seek the law at his mouth, because he is the angel (or messenger) of the Lord of Hosts'" (p. 95).

"He" (Christ) "commands them to obey their constituted teachers, no matter how disedifying might be their private lives. 'Then said Jesus to the multitudes and to his disciples, The Scribes and Pharisees

sit upon the chair of Moses. All things therefore whatsoever they shall say to you, observe and do' ” (p. 96).

“From this passage [Deut. 17 : 8–12], it is evident that in the Hebrew Church the High Priest had the highest jurisdiction in religious matters. By this means, unity of faith and worship was preserved among the people of God.

“Now the Jewish synagogue, as St. Paul testifies, was the type and figure of the Christian Church ; for, (1 Cor. 10 : 11) ‘all things happened to them in figure’ ” (p. 115).

“When our Saviour, the Founder of the New Law, appeared on earth, He came to lop off those excrescences which had grown on the body of the Jewish ecclesiastical code, and to purify the Jewish Church from those human traditions which, in the course of time, became like chaff mixed with the wheat of sound doctrine. For instance, He condemns the Pharisees for prohibiting the performance of works of charity on the Sabbath day, and in the twenty-third chapter of St. Matthew He cites against them a long catalogue of innovations in doctrine and discipline” (pp. 206, 207).

“From these passages”—to repeat, *mutatis mutandis*, the paragraph cited above from page 86 of the Archbishop's “little volume”—“we see, on the one hand,” that the Jewish priests “received full powers to announce” the Law ; “and on the other, that their hearers were obliged” to “observe and do” all things whatsoever they should say unto them. “If, therefore, the” Jewish “Church” did “preach error”—as we are assured by the Archbishop that she did, even to the extent of “a long catalogue of innovations in doctrine and discipline”—was not “God himself,” according to the Archbishop, “responsible for the error ? And could not the faithful (Jewish) soul” have said “to God with all reverence and truth : Thou hast

commanded me, O Lord, to hear Thy Church (the Jewish). If I am deceived (as I certainly have been) by obeying her, Thou art the cause of my error."

What does the Archbishop think of that? Does he think it "reverent" and "truthful?" Yet it is just as "reverent," and as "truthful," in the mouth of the Jew, as it would be, in the case supposed by the Archbishop, in the mouth of a Christian.

So much for the Archbishop's *reductio ad absurdum*; if it proves the infallibility of the Catholic Church, it proves the infallibility of the Jewish Church also. Yet the Jewish Church was not only fallible; it actually failed.

"From what has been said in the preceding pages, it follows that the Catholic Church cannot be reformed. . . .

"My meaning is, that the Church is not susceptible of being reformed in her doctrines. The Church is the work of an Incarnate God. Like all God's works, it is perfect. It is therefore incapable of reform" (p. 91).

The Archbishop's argument is, An infallible God cannot create a fallible Church. He might as well argue that an infallible God cannot create a fallible man. We know that an infallible God *did* create a fallible Church, to wit, the Jewish; the fact, therefore, that the Catholic Church was created by an infallible God, is no proof that she is herself infallible. All God's works are, indeed, "perfect." Adam, as he came from the hand of his Maker, was perfect, though fallible. The Catholic Church, as she came from the hand of her Maker was perfect, whether fallible or infallible. This argument of the Archbishop, therefore, on which he evidently plumes himself, is the baldest paralogism.

"It is a marvellous fact worthy of record, that in the whole history of the Church, from the nineteenth cen-

tury to the first, no solitary example can be adduced to show that any Pope or General Council ever revoked a decree of faith or morals enacted by any preceding Pontiff or Council" (p. 92).

It *would* be "marvellous" to *us*, if it were a fact. But why marvellous to the Archbishop, seeing, if his theory of Infallibility be true, it *must* be a fact? But it is *not* a fact, nevertheless; it is a marvellous—no, *not* a marvellous—*fabrication*, or *repetition* of a fabrication, of the Archbishop's. JANUS in his work on "The Pope and the Council" (English Translation, Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge; Scribner, Welford & Co., New York, 1869, pp. 51-77), gives repeated instances of Pope against Pope, Council against Council, Pope against Council, Council against Pope, with the authorities on which he rests his statements. I shall content myself with giving the well-known instance—well known to the student of Ecclesiastical History—of Pope Vigilius and the Fifth General Council, and the equally well-known instance of Pope Honorius and the Sixth General Council; and I shall give them in the language of one of the Archbishop's own historians, Dupin, the famous Doctor of the Sorbonne and Regius Professor of Divinity at Paris, already referred to. The first of these instances will be found in Chapter V., Century VI., of his "Compendious History of the Church," and the second in Chapter III., Century VII. :

"While the Council was thus preparing to condemn the three Chapters, Pope Vigilius gave his Opinion in Writing to the Emperor, as he had promis'd him. [Here follows an account of the contents of the "Writing" winding up with,] In fine, he exhorts the Emperor to let Things go in the same Terms which that Council [of Chalcedon] had left them in, and by his Apostolical Authority forbids anything to be said or advanced contrary to what he had decided touching the three Chapters.

“ Q. Were the Deliberations of the Council stopp’d by this Judgment of the Pope?

“ A. No : The Emperor caused the Examination of the Affair to be continued ; and in order to oppose the Authority of Vigilius to Vigilius himself, he caused three Letters of Vigilius to be read in the seventh Conference, in which he formally approves the Condemnation of the three Chapters, and condemns them himself. [Then follows an account of the decision of the Council against the three Chapters, etc.]

“ Q. What became of Pope Vigilius after this Decision?

“ A. Justinian [the Emperor] gave Orders that his Name should not be put in the Dypticks,* and sent him into Exile. This Pope, always inconstant, according to his Custom, soon changed his Opinion and Resolution. On the 9th of December he wrote a Letter to Eutychius, in which he blames his own Conduct in refusing to assist at the Council, and retracts what he had written in Defence of the three Chapters, which he condemn’d in very strong Terms, pronouncing an Anathema against those that defended them. This Letter is not the only Act by which Vigilius approv’d the Decision of the fifth Council ; he made a very ample Constitution† by which he authentickly condemn’d the three Chapters.”

So much for Vigilius. I will merely add that the “three chapters” were condemned as being tainted with the Nestorian heresy, and that therefore the error of Vigilius—for, as he was alternately on each side, he must have been in error on one side or the other—was on a matter of *faith*.

* Commonly written *Diptych* ; the catalogue of saints which was rehearsed in the Greek Liturgy.

† “An authoritative ordinance, regulation, or enactment ; especially one made by a Roman emperor, or one affecting ecclesiastical doctrine or discipline.”—*Webster*.

To come to Pope Honorius, and the Sixth General Council :

“ Q. What Order was observ’d amongst the Patriarchs in that Council ?

“ A. The Pope’s* Legates held the first Rank ; George Patriarch of Constantinople the second ; . . . In the 4th Meeting they read the Letters of Pope Agathon, and those of the Council of Rome. . . . In fine, in the seventeenth Meeting, held the 16th of September, 681, at which the Emperor assisted, they publish’d a Decision, by which they approv’d Pope Agathon’s Letter, and the Decision of the Council of Rome. . . . This decision was approv’d by all the Bishops of the Council, who pronounc’d an Anathema against the old and new Hereticks, and in particular against Honorius, who is always reckon’d amongst the Monothelite Patriarchs, and compriz’d in the same Condemnation. . . .

“ Q. You do not doubt then but Honorius was condemn’d in that Council ?

“ A. The Acts of the Council prove it, and there is no appearance of their having been falsified, as Baronius pretended without any foundation. The Council acknowldg’d the Condemnation of that Pope in their Letter, the Emperor declares it in his Edict, Leo II., Agathon’s Successor, says it in three Letters, the whole Roman Church declared it in the forms of the Oaths which they made the Popes take, from the holding of this Council, and the two following General Councils make mention of the condemnation of Honorius.

“ Q. But tell me, I beseech you, do you believe that this Pope was condemn’d in this Council as a Heretick ?

“ A. He is put in the same Rank by this Council, with

* Honorius had been dead forty years, and in that short time no less than nine Popes had succeeded him, the last of whom, Agathon, was Pope at the time of the meeting of the Council.

Sergius, Pyrrhus, and Paul, who are evidently condemn'd as Hereticks ; he is included in the same Anathema, namely, as having taught the same Impieties, and the same Errors. Therefore we cannot doubt of the Council's having condemn'd him as a Heretick.

“ Q. Do you think he was a Heretick ?

“ A. It appears by his Letters that he was in the same Sentiments with Sergius, and that he plainly maintain'd the same Points the Monothelites did ; the one, that we ought not to say either that there is one or two Operations in Jesus Christ ; the other, that we ought to say there is but one Will in Jesus Christ. Theodorus, Sergius, Pyrrhus, Paul, and the other Monothelites did not say more ; therefore the Council had reason to put him in the same Rank, and 'tis in vain to go about to excuse him from having maintain'd that Error.”

Here we have by the testimony of an unimpeachable witness, of the Archbishop's own Communion (who has drawn from the original fountains), the Fifth General Council condemning Pope Vigilius, and Pope Vigilius condemning himself ; the Sixth General Council (presided over by Pope Agathon's legates and following up the previous action of the Roman Council held by Agathon himself) condemning and anathematizing Pope Honorius, and Pope Leo II.* and “ the whole Roman Church ” joining in the condemnation and anathematization. And yet the Archbishop has so mean an opinion of our knowledge of the veriest rudi-

* “ Anathematizamus. . . . nec non et Honorium, qui hanc apostolicam ecclesiam non apostolicæ traditionis doctrina lustravit, sed profana prodione immaculatam subvertere conatus est [We anathematize. . . . also Honorius, who did not purify this apostolic church with the doctrine of apostolic tradition, but by a profane prodition (i.e., *treachery*—mark the play upon the words) attempted to subvert it hitherto immaculate].—Leo II. Epist. ad Constant. Imp. ap. Mansi. xi. 731.” See this and other citations in *Gieseler*, § 128, Notes 14, 15, and 17.

ments of Ecclesiastical History that he has the assurance to put on solemn "record" the deliberate assertion that "in the whole history of the Church, from the nineteenth century to the first, no solitary example can be adduced to show that any Pope or General Council ever revoked a decree of faith or morals enacted by any preceding Pontiff or Council!" Brass was the current coin of the elder Rome, and those old Pagans made shift to rub along with it; but the Rome of to-day must bring us not so base a metal, if she expects to buy us over; not even "40 Thousand," no, nor 40 Hundred Thousand, *such* sesterces will suffice.

The Archbishop argues the Infallibility of the Catholic Church from the Apostolic Commission (St. Matt. 28 : 19, 20 ; St. John 20 : 21-23), from St. Matt. 16 : 18, ("and the gates of hell shall not prevail against it"—which is a promise of perpetuity, not of infallibility), and from Eph. 4 : 11-14, laying particular stress on the words, "Behold, I am with you." But he answers himself in the same breath; for, he goes on: "These words, '*I am with you*,' are frequently addressed in Sacred Scripture, by the Almighty, to his Prophets and Patriarchs" (p. 88). If, then, they prove the infallibility of the Catholic Church, they prove the infallibility of the Jewish Church also; which is proving a little too much, seeing the Jewish Church was not only fallible, but by the testimony of the Archbishop himself, as we have already seen, did actually err, even to the extent (p. 207) of "a long catalogue of innovations in doctrine and discipline."

"But," says the Archbishop, "mark the consequences that follow from denying it. If your church is not infallible, it is liable to err, for there is no medium between infallibility and liability to error. . . . If so, you are in doubt whether you are listening to truth or falsehood. If you are in doubt, you can have

no faith, for faith excludes doubt" (p. 89). Does it? What does the Apostle mean, then, when he says (2 Cor. 5 : 7), "We walk by faith, not by sight? The two are evidently put by him in antithesis. As evidently, sight, as here used by him, excludes doubt. If, then, faith also excludes doubt, where is the antithesis?

Again, religious faith is possessed of a *moral* quality; it has its seat in the *heart*. "If thou believest with all thine *heart*, thou mayest." "With the *heart* man believeth unto righteousness" (Acts 8 : 37 ; Rom, 10 : 10). But *Infallibility*, in the Archbishop's use of it, involves *absolute* certainty, and there can be no moral quality in our belief of that of which we are *absolutely* certain. If the Archbishop were to deny, or doubt, that two and two are four, or that the sum of the three angles of a triangle is equal to two right angles, I should consider that doubt, or that denial, as springing not from "an evil heart of unbelief," but from a mind off the hinges.

"There can be no faith in the hearer unless there is unerring authority in the speaker" (p. 89). Is this so? Let us see. Either the Archbishop *knows* that there is "unerring authority" in the Church, or he does not know it. If he does not know it, then, according to his own argument only six lines above in the same paragraph, he does not know, when he is listening to her, whether he is "listening to truth or falsehood." If he does know it, then his reception of her teachings is not faith, but "sight," that is, knowledge; there is no moral quality in that reception, any more than in his reception of the truths of Arithmetic and Geometry above mentioned: he simply walks by sight, not by faith, contrary to the example of St. Paul and his fellow Christians, who walked "by faith, not by sight." It is not true, then, *necessarily* (as the Archbishop represents it), that "faith excludes doubt." It may, or it may not; that depends on its strength. *Knowledge* ex-

cludes doubt; but it excludes faith (religious faith) also. Hence in that world where we shall know as we are known, faith is lost in sight, as hope, also, is swallowed up in fruition.

"You admit infallible certainty in the physical sciences, why should you deny it in the science of salvation?" (p. 89). For the same reason that we deny it in the moral sciences, which are akin to the "science of salvation," whereas the physical sciences have no kinship with it. "The mariner, guided by his compass, knows amid the raging storm and the darkness of the night, that he is steering his course directly to the city of his destination" (p. 89). He does *not* "know" it; he *believes* it; and his faith, though it does *not* "exclude doubt," is, on the whole, a safe guide. But there have been instances of ships wrecked through some attracting substance built into the ship, it may be, near the compass, unnoticed by the builder, and unknown to the mariner.

"And is not an infallible guide as necessary to conduct you to the city of God in heaven?" (p. 89.) I will consider that question in the next chapter.

The Archbishop is very much exercised about a sentence in one of the "Homilies of the Church of England," which "says that the Church 'lay buried in damnable idolatry for eight hundred years and more'" (p. 84). I will match it with more than one from the LORD himself, by the mouth of his prophets Ezekiel and Jeremiah: "In the day when I chose Israel. . . . I said unto them, . . . defile not yourselves with the idols of Egypt. . . . But they rebelled against me, . . . neither did they forsake the idols of Egypt. . . . Yet also I lifted up my hand unto them in the wilderness, . . . for their heart went after their idols. . . . When I had brought them into the land [of Canaan] . . . there they presented the provocation of their offering. . . . Are

ye polluted after the manner of your fathers? . . . ye pollute yourselves with all your idols even unto this day" (Ezek. 20 : 5, 7, 8, 15, 16, 28, 30, 31). "Behold, I will give this city into the hand of the Chaldeans, . . . with the houses upon whose roofs they have offered incense unto Baal, and poured out drink-offerings unto other gods, to provoke me to anger. For the children of Israel and the children of Judah have only done evil before me from their youth : for the children of Israel have only provoked me to anger with the work of their hands, saith the LORD. For this city hath been to me as a provocation of mine anger and of my fury from the day that they built it unto this day" (Jer. 32 : 28-31); considerably *over* "eight hundred years and more." And as to the *entireness* of the corruption, read what Isaiah, a hundred and fifty years earlier, says in the first chapter of his prophecy, particularly in the fifth and sixth verses : "The whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it ; but wounds, and bruises, and putrifying sores." Surey, if all *this* did not break the *continuity* of the Jewish Church, then neither did all *that* break the *continuity* of the Christian Church, and therefore the "issue" raised by the Archbishop between "the personal veracity of our Saviour" and that "of the Reformers," is no issue at all. "Christ," says the Archbishop, quoting the declaration about "the gates of hell" (St. Matt. 16 : 18), "makes here a solemn prediction that no error shall ever invade His Church ; and if she fell into error, the gates of hell have certainly prevailed against her" (p. 84). Christ does nothing of the kind. He simply promises that His Church shall *continue* to the end of the world ; and if the idolatry charged did not, and could not, as we have seen it could not, break the *continuity*, the promise stands unaffected, even though the charge be true.

Having thus disposed of the Archbishop's logic in this chapter, I shall conclude with a specimen of his rhetoric, merely interpolating, in brackets, enough to make it consistent with the facts of the case :

"Children of the Catholic [meaning Roman] Church, give thanks to God for having made you members of that communion in which you are preserved [as Vigilius and Honorius were] from all errors in faith, and from all illusion in the practice of virtue. . . . You are a part of that universal communion which has no 'High Church' and 'Low Church' [only Franciscans, and Dominicans, at swords' points on what, being now, always has been, an article of faith—for the faith never changes—to wit, the Immaculate Conception] ; no 'New School' and 'Old School' [only Jansenists and Jesuits, at swords' points on Predestination and Free Will ; and a host of other *ists* and *isms* ! "Only that, and nothing more !"] for you all belong to that School which is 'ever ancient and ever new.' [That must be an *Irish* School !] You enjoy that profound peace and tranquillity [*"solitudinem faciunt, PACEM appellant,"* which may be freely rendered, "Order reigns in Warsaw !" *] which springs from the conscious possession of the whole truth [by the Infallible Pope, who deals it out to you in dribblets, twelve articles in 1564, one in 1854, another in 1870, and another—when ?—and thereby saves you the trouble and responsibility (?) of doing your own thinking]. Well may you exclaim : 'Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity' " (p. 90).

The only analogue of the Archbishop's "unity" that I can think of, is to be found in Barnum's "Happy Family ;" but I pity the poor animals when I think what they must have gone through, in learning to re-

* The Russian General's announcement of the putting down of *overt* aspirations after freedom of thought and action. It well translates Tacitus.

nounce the exercise of the faculties that God had given them.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

THE purpose of the Archbishop in this chapter is to disprove the right of private Christians to interpret the Scriptures for themselves. In opposition to the Archbishop, I assert not only the right but the duty of every Christian, however humble, to interpret the Scriptures for himself, studying them diligently, with prayer for the illumination of the Holy Ghost, and availing himself of every means accessible to him, including the Church and the Ministry, of getting at their true meaning.

"The Jews," says the Archbishop (pp. 94, 95), "never dreamed of settling their religious controversies by a private appeal to the word of God." And in proof of this he cites a *part* of Deuteronomy 17:8-12, which relates to civil suits and criminal prosecutions *that could not be settled privately*, including among them, of course (since the Jewish Government was a Theocracy), matters pertaining to religion. This would have been at once apparent, if the Archbishop had cited the whole of the five verses, or even the first half of the first of them, namely, the eighth, which runs thus: "If there arise a matter *too hard for thee* in judgment, between *blood and blood*, between *plea and plea*, and between *stroke and stroke*," or, as the Archbishop gives it—for he cites this further on, in the chapter on the primacy (p. 114), "If there be a *hard matter* in judgment between *blood and blood*, *cause and cause*, *leprosy and leprosy*, . . . thou shalt come to the priests of the levitical race, *and to the judge*," etc. I have *italicized*

certain words, to draw the reader's attention to them as showing what questions they are that are to be decided by the priests *and the judge*. Even in the paragraph under consideration, enough is cited to show that they are "hard and doubtful" matters, but not enough (the Archbishop is *too* arch for that) to show what the matters are, namely, cases between man and man that strike at the being of society, and that must, therefore, be determined by a tribunal of last resort, which, however, is no more necessarily an *infallible* tribunal, than "the Supreme Court at Washington" is, to "the Chief Justice" of which the Archbishop in the chapter on the Infallibility of the Popes (p. 144) compares the "Sovereign Pontiff." Such a tribunal every society, civil or religious, necessarily has ; it could not continue in being, without it. But what is there in all this to prevent "Jews," or Christians, from "settling their religious controversies by a private appeal to the word of God," any more than there is in the jurisdiction of the "Supreme Court," aforesaid, to prevent people from "settling," as they often do settle, their secular differences by a private appeal, under the aid and advice of judicious and friendly counsellors, to the law of the land? And what is there in it to prevent "Jews," or Christians, from leaving a vast number of their religious controversies—those, namely, that do not strike at the being of the Church—unsettled? The truth is, the *mania* of Rome for "settling" things—a mania which possesses also some Protestant Sects, though, in this respect, they are getting wiser, while she is getting more foolish—has unsettled all western Christendom, and broken it up into contending sects, the end whereof who can foresee? Rome must be always dabbling in the mud. "Controversies" that had been going on under her very nose from the twelfth to the eighteenth century, *salva fide et salva ecclesia*, she must "settle" in the

nineteenth. Another settling awaits her; a settling with the Catholic Church, and with the head of the Catholic Church, and not till then will the peace of Christendom come.

"But when our Redeemer abolished the old law, and established his Church, did he intend that his gospel should be disseminated by the circulation of the Bible, or by the living voice of his disciples? This is a vital question. I answer most emphatically, that it was *by preaching* ALONE that he intended to convert the nations, and *by preaching alone they were converted*" (p. 98).

Here again, as in so many other instances, past and to come, the Archbishop shall answer himself—for "liars" are not the only persons that "need to have long memories;" sophists are in the same category, —and shall do it "most emphatically."

In the chapter on matrimony, the Archbishop, in opposition to those who from the clause, "except it be for fornication," in St. Matt. 19:9, argue the lawfulness of divorce *a vinculo matrimonii* for that cause, quotes and comments upon St. Mark 10:11, 12, St. Luke 16:18, and 1 Cor. 7:10, 11, in which there is no such exception, and adds:

"We must *therefore* admit that, according to the religion of Jesus Christ, conjugal infidelity does not warrant either party to marry again, or we are forced to the conclusion that *the vast number of Christians whose knowledge of Christianity was derived SOLELY from the teachings of Saints Mark, Luke, and Paul*, were imperfectly instructed in their faith" (p. 427).

It is the *written* "teachings" that the Archbishop here refers to, for he has just quoted those written teachings on this point, and he is drawing an *inference* from them; for he says, "We must *therefore* admit," etc. His argument may be paraphrased thus: "We must not suppose that the Bible was always, as it is

now, a compact book, bound in a neat form. It was *for several centuries in scattered fragments, spread over different parts of Christendom.*" (p. 100.) "The Gospels and Epistles were addressed to particular persons or particular churches." (p. 98.) St. Matthew's Gospel was addressed to the "Christians of Palestine." (p. 427.) "*For many years after* the Gospels and Epistles were written, the knowledge of them was confined to the churches to which they were addressed." (p. 102.) St. Matthew's Gospel, therefore, being confined "for many years," if not "for several centuries," to the Jewish Christians, the "vast number" of gentile Christians must have "derived" their "knowledge of Christianity solely from" one or more of the other Gospels or of the Epistles.

Let the reader now compare the paragraph quoted above from page 427, especially the part I have *italicized*, with the italicized part of the paragraph from page 98, and he will see that the Archbishop has "*most emphatically*" answered himself.* It isn't the first time that we have seen this

"engineer
Hoise with his own petar,"

and it won't be the last. The truth is, the Archbishop is wrong both ways; it was not by preaching alone, nor by the Bible alone, that the nations were to be converted and built up in the faith, but by both together, and as fast and as far as the successive portions of the New Testament came into existence and became accessible, they went with and followed up the living voice of the preacher; the very purpose for which they were written.

* Should the Archbishop undertake to quibble on the word "converted," and say that the nations were converted before the Gospels or Epistles were written, that won't help him unless he is prepared to maintain that they were to be "converted" by preaching alone, and after that, to be "built up in their most holy faith" by the Bible alone.

What says St. Luke? "Forasmuch as many have taken in hand to set forth in order a declaration of those things which are most surely believed among us, even as they delivered them unto us, which from the beginning were eye-witnesses, and ministers of the word; it seemed good to me also, having had perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee in order, most excellent Thophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty (*ἀσφάλειαν*, freedom from error) of those things wherein thou hast been instructed"—literally, "catechized." (St. Luke 1:1-4.)

It is plain, then, that the office of Scripture was to authenticate the spoken word; to *fix* Tradition, and hand it down in a safe channel, instead of trusting so precious a deposit to the treacherous memory of successive generations. The very statement of the Roman doctrine of tradition, to wit, an *esoteric* tradition, (*disciplina arcani*), transmitted orally through a select few who alone should have the custody of it, is enough to condemn it. It is the "Church," the *whole* Church, not a clique within it, still less a Roman clique, least of all a Vaticano-Tridentine clique, that is "the pillar and ground of the truth."

"Until the religious Revolution of the sixteenth century," says the Archbishop, "it was a thing unheard of from the beginning of the world, that people should be governed by the dead letter of the law, either in civil or ecclesiastical affairs." (p. 99.)

Certainly it was "unheard of," and it is still, except by the Archbishop. "He is the only one who has got the *news*," and he makes as much parade over it as some enterprising purveyor for the press sometimes does when he has *stumbled* upon an equally trustworthy *item*.

"What is the use," says the Archbishop, "of your preaching sermons and catechizing the young, if the Bible at home [meaning thereby "the dead letter" of the Bible] is a sufficient guide for your people? The

fact is, you Reverend gentlemen contradict in practice what you so vehemently advance in theory." (pp. 99, 100.)

"The fact is," you, Most Reverend Sir, either misapprehend our position, or else wilfully misrepresent it. And of this you seem to have a dim consciousness; for you say, in the next paragraph, "I will address myself now in a friendly spirit to a non-Catholic," meaning a non-Roman. Certainly, you have been addressing yourself to him in any thing but "a friendly spirit," imputing to him that which, if true, would make a drivelling idiot intellectually respectable alongside of him. I will not stoop to misrepresent the Roman Church as you misrepresent the Church of England, and the great body of Protestants, on this point. I could not do it and preserve my self-respect.

The Roman Church holds that there are two sources of "saving truth," (*salutaris veritatis*), the "written books," and the "unwritten traditions which, received by the Apostles from the mouth of Christ himself, or from the Apostles themselves (2 Thess. 2 : 14.) the Holy Ghost dictating, have come down even unto us, transmitted, as it were, from hand to hand." (*Concil. Trident., Sess. IV. Can. I.*, Buckley's Translation, London, 1851, p. 18.—For the original Latin, see Browne on the Articles, Am. Ed., p. 130.)

In opposition to this, the Church of England, in common with the great body of Protestants, maintains (Art. VI.), that there is but one source* of saving truth. Her words are, "Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation; so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite or necessary to salvation."

* The Illumination of the Spirit is not *here* in question, on either side.

This is what is meant by "The Bible and the Bible only." *Not* The Bible, to the exclusion of the Church and Ministry,—“as we be slanderously reported” by the Archbishop; *but*, The Bible, to the exclusion of the “unwritten traditions.” Bellarmine understands this, if the Archbishop doesn’t: “The controversy between us and the heretics consists in two things. The first is, that *we* assert that in Scripture is not expressly contained all necessary doctrine, whether concerning faith or morals, and therefore that, besides the written word of God, there is moreover needed the unwritten word, *i.e.*, Divine and Apostolical Tradition. But *they* teach, that all things necessary for faith and morals are contained in the Scriptures, *and that therefore there is no need of the unwritten word.*”—*De Verbo Dei non Scripto*, Lib. IV. cap. III.—See the Original Latin in *Browne*, p. 131.

Now in this “controversy” the Fathers are with us, and against Rome. Tertullian says: “Let the school of Hermogenes show that it is written. If it is not written, let them fear the woe which is destined for them who add to or take away.”—*Adv. Hermog.*, c. 22.

Origen says: “If any thing remain which Holy Scripture doth not determine, no third Scripture [he had been speaking of two—the Old Testament and the New] ought to be had recourse to. . . . For God would not have us know all things in this world.—*Hom. V. in Levit.*

Hippolytus writes: “Whosoever will exercise piety toward God can learn it nowhere but from the Holy Scriptures.”—*Contra Hæresim Noeti*, c. 9.

Athanasius: “The holy and divinely-inspired Scriptures are of themselves sufficient to the enunciation of truth.—*Contra Gentes*, Tom. I. p. 1.

Cyril of Jerusalem: “Concerning the divine and holy mysteries of the faith, even the most casual remark ought not to be delivered without the sacred Scriptures.”—*Catech.* IV., 12.

Basil : " Believe those things which are written ; the things which are not written seek not."—*Hom. XXIX., adv. Cal. S. Trin.* " It is a manifest defection from the faith, and a proof of arrogance, either to reject anything of what is written, or to introduce anything that is not."—*De Fide*, c. 1.

Ambrose : " How can we use those things which we find not in the Scriptures?"—*Offic. Lib. I. c. 23.*

Jerome : " As we deny not those things which are written, so we refuse those which are not written."—*Adv. Helvidium juxta finem*, Tom. IV. Pars. II. p. 141, Edit. Benedict.

Augustine : " In those things which are plainly laid down in Scripture, all things are found which embrace faith and morals."—*De Doctr. Christ.*, L. ii. c. 9, Tom. III. p. 24. " If an angel from heaven announce to you anything beyond (*præterquam*) what ye have received in the legal and evangelical Scriptures, let him be anathema."—*Contr. Petil.*, L. III. c. 6, T. IX. p. 301.

Theodoret : " Bring not human reasonings and syllogisms ; I rely on Scripture."—*Dial. I. Ἀτρεπτ*

John Damascene : " All things that are delivered to us by the Law, the Prophets, the Apostles, and the Evangelists, we receive, acknowledge, and reverence, seeking for nothing beyond these."—*De Orthod. Fide.*, L. i. c. 1. See the above quotations more at large, and in the Original Latin and Greek, in Browne on the Articles, pp. 148, 149.—See also, in the same, p. 147, this extract from Irenæus which is specially to the point : " We have received the disposition of our salvation by no others but those by whom the Gospel came to us ; which they then preached, and afterwards by God's will delivered to us in the Scriptures, to be the pillar and ground of our faith."—L. III. c. 1.

Irenæus says, the Gospel which the Apostles preached they afterward delivered to us in the Scriptures. Rome says, they delivered only a part of

it in the Scriptures, leaving the rest to unwritten tradition. Which shall we believe? I prefer to believe Irenæus, the pupil of Polycarp, the disciple of St. John.

But did not some of these very Fathers speak of a "canon of truth" according to which the Scriptures ought to be interpreted? Yes, they spoke of the Creed, as such "canon;" but then the Creed was not an unwritten tradition, nor was it, in their view, outside of Scripture except as to its form and arrangement; for every article of it they recognized as contained in Scripture.

But did not the Fathers appeal to tradition in arguing with heretics? Yes, but not as adding to the teachings of Scripture, but only as confirming them. I challenge the Archbishop to produce a single passage from any of the Fathers of the first four centuries, asserting the existence of an unwritten tradition containing a doctrine not in Holy Scripture and yet necessary to salvation. Let him produce one such passage if he can, or else let him hereafter, on this point, forever hold his peace.

"What the civil code is to the citizen, the Scripture is to the Christian. The Word of God, as well as the civil law, must have an interpreter, by whose decision we are obliged to abide." (p. 99).

Only a small portion of Scripture, to wit, the *statutory*, is analogous to the "civil code;" the remaining, and by far the greater, portion, historical, prophetic, devotional, needs no *tribunal* to interpret it; nay, is, from its very nature, outside the domain of any tribunal. Even the statutory portion, like the "civil code," needs a tribunal only when a practical *case* arises; and then it needs one at hand, and not one afar off. Cases of *morals*,—not abstract or hypothetical cases, (for the ecclesiastical tribunal, if it is to follow the analogy of the civil tribunal, does n't deal with such,) but concrete cases, in other words, *charges of immorality*--are de-

cided by local tribunals, with the right of appeal, it may be, to a higher local tribunal, as, for instance, from the parish priest to the Bishop, or from a Diocesan court to a Provincial one. Cases of *discipline*, not directly involving morals, are decided in the same way. So *were* cases of *faith*, for the first three centuries, there being then no *general* tribunal ; for the Pope was not then recognized as such, as we shall see, further on. The highest tribunal is, the *whole* Church, represented in General Council, and afterwards accepting, or rejecting, the formal judgments of such Council. It is not often that such an assemblage has been called into being. Even of those claimed to be General Councils, the number is but small ; of really General ones, still smaller ; only Six, whose formal judgments have been definitively accepted and acted on by the whole Church. These were called into being, *pro re nata*, as emergencies arose. These emergencies are not likely to arise in the future. All the Articles of the Faith have been already adjudicated. As to the fourteen new *articles*, so called, of Modern Rome, and the fourteen newer ones that she may have in reserve, locked up in the storehouse of unwritten tradition, waiting their turn to be let out, one by one, or in a batch of a baker's dozen, by the keys of St. Peter, we are ready to submit them, each and all, as Cranmer, and Luther, were, before us, to a really General council, not a packed one, like that of the Vatican of the other day, and to abide the action (whether of acceptance or of rejection) of the whole Church upon its formal judgments. Meanwhile, we shall get along, as the Church of the first three centuries did, with Diocesan and Provincial tribunals, with the advantage over it, however, of the adjudications of the whole Church of the three following centuries. And we shall continue to maintain consistently, in theory and in practice, private judgment and Church authority ; the latter, as

necessary to the being of a Church ; the former, not only as the right, but as the duty of every man,—a duty which he owes to the manhood that God has given him, and which he may not shirk or draw back from, or seek to shoulder off from himself on to others.

The Archbishop charges us with inconsistency, in holding to “ The Bible, and the Bible only,” and, in the same breath, to the necessity of the Church and the Ministry ; but he fails, as we have seen, to make good the charge. I charge him—and I will bring the charge *home* to him—with inconsistency, in denouncing private interpretation, and, in the same breath, appealing to it.

1. In denouncing private interpretation :

“ It is, therefore, a grave perversion of the sacred Text, to adduce these words [the words, “ Search the Scriptures’] in vindication of the *private interpretation* of the Scriptures.” (p. 98.)

“ Thus we see that in the Old and the New Dispensation, the people were to be guided by a living authority, and not by their *private interpretation* of the Scriptures.” (p. 99.)

“ Hence, the doctrine of *private interpretation* would render many men’s salvation not only difficult, but impossible.” (p. 104.)

“ Does not the conduct of the Reformers conclusively show the utter folly of interpreting the Scriptures by *private judgment* ?” (p. 105.)

“ One will prove from the Holy Book that Jesus Christ is not God. Others will appeal to the same text to attest His divinity. . . .

“ Very recently several hundred Mormon women. . . .

“ Such is the legitimate fruit of *private interpretation*.” (pp. 106, 107.)

2. In appealing to it in the same breath :

What are the Archbishop’s 339 appeals (if I have

counted right) to Scripture, but so many appeals to the private interpretation of his non-Roman readers? Or, does he expect them to go and ask the Pope if the Archbishop's interpretation is right, and, if he says yes, then to go over in a body to the Roman Church? Or perhaps he expects them to follow in the footsteps of the late Reverend Orby Shipley, of the Church of England, now Mister Orby Shipley of the Church of Rome, who thus writes to the *London Times*: "For the last time I exercised my private judgment, as every person must exercise that gift of God in some way and to some extent, and I humbly sought admission into the communion of the Catholic [he means the Roman] Church." In other words, "I exercised my private judgment" in *strangling* my private judgment; I used "that gift of God" to *hurl it back upon the GIVER*. *Habemus reum confitentem*. We have him pleading guilty to *intellectual and moral suicide*. What remains but to take up the *corpse*, and carry it forth, and bury it out of sight, and leave it

"To lie in cold *obstruction*, and to *rot*."

Pass we on!

"A copy of the sacred volume is handed to you by your minister, who says: 'Take this book; you will find it all-sufficient for your salvation.' But here a serious difficulty awaits you at the very threshold of your investigations. What assurance have you that the book he hands you is the *inspired* Word of God?"

We have the same "assurance" that you have. The same *evidence* is accessible to us that is accessible to you, and it is not *very* assuming in us to assume that we are, to say the least, equally as capable as you of weighing it; especially as *weighing* it, involves private judgment, and you are not allowed, in this matter, to have any private judgment, but must take the say-so of your church, without even weighing her testimony.

We, on the contrary, weigh all the testimony, including that of your church, which is but a very small part of the whole ; for we have the testimony of the whole Church before the division of the East and West ; the testimony of the Greek Church since that division ; the testimony of the Church of England and of nineteenth-twentieths of all Protestants since the Reformation ; the testimony of the early heretics and schismatics, nearly all of whom recognized the canon of Scripture received by the Church ; in fine, the testimony of the early adversaries of Christianity, Trypho, and Celsus, and Julian. If I were arguing with an infidel, I might show how much stronger is the evidence of the genuineness and authenticity of the books of the New Testament, than of the works of the ancient Greek and Latin historians ; but such an argument would be out of place here. As to the *inspiration* of the Scriptures, it rests on the same kind of evidence that the authority and infallibility of the Roman Church is *claimed* by you to rest on, to wit, the declarations of these Scriptures themselves ; and as I am not arguing with an infidel, this is all that I am concerned to show. I will not, because I need not, cite these declarations at large, but will merely give reference to some of them, to wit : St. Matt. 10 : 19, 20 ; St. Luke, 12 : 11, 12 ; St. John 14 : 16, 17, 26 ; 15 : 26 ; 16 : 13, 14 ; Acts 15 : 28 ; Rom. 16 : 25, 26 ; 1 Cor. 2 : 4, 5, 9-16 ; 14 : 37 ; Gal. 1 : 11, 12 ; Heb. 1 : 1, 2 ; 1 St. Peter 1 : 11, 12 ; 2 St. Peter 1 : 21 ; Rev. 1 : 10, 11.

But there is another difficulty, it seems, in our way. "It [the "book he hands you"] may, for aught you know, contain more than the Word of God, or it may not contain all the Word of God." (p. 100.)

I answer, we know just as much about it as you do, for we have the same identical information in our possession that you have in yours, to wit, the testimony (not merely of the modern Roman Church but) of the

whole Church from the beginning ; and we are as able to sift it as you are. We have sifted it, and, as the result, we have come to the conclusion, first, that the book we call the Bible does *not* “ contain more than the Word of God,”—a conclusion in which we are happy to find the Greek Church, the Roman Church, and nineteen-twentieths of all Protestants, agreeing with us, and in which, therefore, we feel pretty safe ; and we have come to the conclusion, secondly, that it *does* “ contain all the Word of God,” a conclusion in which you do not agree with us ; for you claim that certain other books, which we call Apocryphal, are really Canonical. What is your evidence for this claim ? “ The Catholic Church,” you say, “ in the plenitude of her authority, in the third Council of Carthage, (A.D. 397,) separated the chaff from the wheat, and declared what Books were Canonical, and what were apocryphal.” I reply, “ The Catholic Church” did nothing of the kind, for the simple reason, first, that the Council of Carthage was not a General Council, but merely an African Council, of only forty-four Bishops ; and, secondly,—a reason that you will appreciate,—that “ a Roman Council (see Bp. Hopkins, *End of Controversy Controverted*, vol. i. p. 325) held A.D. 494, under [the infallible] Pope Gelasius, by seventy Bishops, for the express purpose of separating [what, according to you, had been already separated ninety-seven years before,] the canonical Scriptures, the Councils and the fathers, from the numerous apocryphal books which were in circulation,” deliberately excluded from the canon the Second Book of Maccabees, the very Book you quote (p. 184) in behalf of the Invocation of Saints (p. 206) in behalf of Purgatory, and (p. 308) in behalf of Masses for the Dead, and which the Council of Carthage included in the canon. Evidently, his Infallibility, sturdy old Roman as he was, though said by some to have been of African birth, had come to the conclusion,

"*Delenda est Carthago*,"—*et deleuit*. Which was right, the African Council, or the Infallible Pope? For my part, I side with his Holiness on this point. And I go further, and side with his successor a hundred years later, Pope Gregory the Great—him that denounced as the forerunner of Antichrist any one who should claim to be Universal Bishop; grand old Pope he was, even if he wasn't infallible—I say, I side with him in excluding not only the second book of Maccabees, but the first book also; for he introduces a quotation from it with these words: "We shall not go too far if we bring forward a testimony from those books which, *although not canonical*, are used to edify the Church." (*Moral. in Job. Lib. 19, c. xxxiv. Op., Tom. 1, p. 622, a.* Quoted by Bp. Hopkins, *ut supra*, p. 328.) I will cite one more witness and one whom you can't object to; for you tell us (p. 110) that "Pope Damasus commanded a new and complete translation of the Scriptures to be made into the Latin language," and that the task "was assigned to St. Jerome, the most learned Hebrew scholar of his time."

This was some years before the Council of Carthage, for that Council did not meet till twelve years after the death of Damasus. Of course, St. Jerome knew what Books were then received in the Church as canonical Scripture. What is his testimony? "As, therefore, the Church reads indeed Judith and Tobit and the Books of the Maccabees, but does not receive them among the canonical Scriptures, so also she reads these two volumes [Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus] for the edification of the people, not for the confirmation of ecclesiastical doctrine." (Tom. I. p. 938. Ed. Bened.—See the original Latin in Browne on the Articles, p. 188.) This declaration of St. Jerome is a part of his Preface to the Proverbs of Solomon. Our canon and his are the same, and they agree perfectly with that of the Jews, to whom "were committed the oracles of God,"

(Rom. 3 : 2), and whom Christ never charges with either adding to or taking from them, but with making them void by their tradition. I will only add that the author of the Second Book of Maccabees, your favorite (apocryphal) book, evidently never dreamed that his unpretending history was inspired Scripture ; for, in winding up his narrative, he says, “ And here will I make an end. And if I have done well and as is fitting the story, it is that which I desired ; but if slenderly and meanly, it is that which I could attain unto.”— Really, it requires a good deal of effrontery in you and your Communion to foist such a man, *nolentem volentem*, into the category of canonical writers, and his modest “ little volume” into the Sacred Canon !

Since writing the above, in searching in the library of the late Dr. Trapier, now in my custody, I came across (what I had hitherto overlooked) *Dupin on the Canon*, the same Dupin from whose *History of the Church* I have already quoted. I make a few extracts :

“ As for the other Books, viz. Tobit, Judith, Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, and the two Books of the Maccabees, they were never in the Jewish Canon, and are not to be met with in the Ancient Canons of Sacred Books, drawn up by the Christian Writers, except in those of the Churches of Rome and Africk. . . .

“ Origen in the Epistle to Africanus observes that the Books of Tobit and Judith were not received by the Jews, and that they were not so much as plac’d among their Apocryphal Books, tho’ the Churches did make use of them. . . .

“ The Book of Judith is not only rejected in all the ancient catalogues of Sacred Writings, but is likewise not so much as cited by the Ancient Fathers. . . .

“ The Books of Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus are put down in the Ancient Catalogues among the useful Books which are read in the Church with Edification, but are uncanonical. . . .

"Lastly, the two Books of the Maccabees are cast out of the Canon of Sacred Books in the Catalogues of Melito, Origen, the Council of Laodicea, St. Cyril, St. Hilary, St. Athanasius, St. Jerome, and in the rest which we have already mentioned." Vol. I. Chap. I. Sect. V.

In the next chapter, he proceeds to enquire how, notwithstanding all this, these books "came to be inserted into the Canon," and, after giving the arguments advanced in behalf of them, says, "It were to be wished that this Scheme were as Solid as 'tis Commodious, for an answer to the objection beforay lay'd down: But 'tis such an easy matter to overthrow it, that whoever would persist in defending it against the Hereticks, would soon find himself engaged in such a Labyrinth, as would be difficult for him to extricate himself out of." He comes, however, in the next paragraph, as a true son of the Church, to this conclusion: "All these Reasons and Considerations joyn'd together, are sufficient to establish the Authority [he does not say, Canonicity] of these Books, of which the decision of the Council of Trent has left no reason [he should have said *no room*] to doubt. For tho' no new Revelation has been made to the Church, yet it may after so long a tract of time [more than 1700 years] be better assured of the Truth and Genuineness of a Work, than it was before, when after a due examination of the Matter, it has met with a sufficient Testimony not to doubt any longer of it, and a sufficient Tradition, to judge it to be Authentic." The humor of all this is inimitable and irresistible. Dupin is evidently a wag, and must have enjoyed hugely the sly dig he was giving the Tridentine Fathers. It reminds me of a similar dig in Professor Ornsby's Note on 1 St. John 5 : 7, in his edition of the Greek Testament, approved by Cardinal Cullen, where, after giving the arguments for and against the authenticity of the verse, the latter prepon-

derating overwhelmingly, he adds : “ The above arguments are stated by way of furnishing a general answer to difficulties commonly urged ; but such difficulties, even were the solution less satisfactory, must always, to us be sufficiently disposed of by the Council of Trent, which has sanctioned, as sacred and canonical, the entire books of Sacred Scripture, with all their parts, as they were wont to be read in the Catholic Church, and are found in the old Vulgate Latin edition : which is the case with the passage before us ! ”

How “ commodious ” to have somebody to do our *thinking* for us ! especially when he can think to such good purpose as his Infallibility, Pope Sixtus V., who, about twenty years after the Council of Trent, “ published a rectified edition of the Bible as the standard Vulgate, along with a Bull, in which these words appear : * ‘ We have corrected it with our own hand. . . . and from our certain knowledge, and from the plenitude of Apostolical power, we decree that this Vulgate Latin edition of the sacred page of the Old as well as the New Testament, is to be esteemed, without any doubt or controversy as thoroughly amended as it can be.’ ” See Letter XVIII. of *The End of Controversy Controverted*, by Bishop Hopkins, who adds, in the next paragraph, “ Yet, before two years had elapsed, so many errors had been discovered in the edition which Sixtus V. had thus published *from his certain knowledge and from the plenitude of Apostolic power*, that Pope Clement VIII. was constrained to call in the copies, and to put out another, which is the present standard. And the Preface to this expressly states that † ‘ Although

* “ Nostra nos ipsi manu correximus, . . . Ex certa nostra scientia, deque Apostolicæ potestatis plenitudine, statuimus eam Vulgatam sacræ tam Veteris quam Novi Testamenti paginæ Latinam editionem, . . . sine ulla dubitatione aut controversia censendam esse hanc ipsam, quam nunc prout optime fieri potuit emendatam.”

† “ In hac tamen pervulgata Lectione, sicut nonnulla consulto mutata, ita etiam alia, quæ *mutanda videbantur*, CONSULTO immutata relictæ sunt.”

some things were advisedly changed from the common reading, there were others, which seemed to require a change, advisedly suffered to remain unaltered.' " Such is the Latin Bible which, in the Roman Church, supplants, as the standard of Appeal, the original Greek and Hebrew.

" But even when you are assured that the Bible contains the Word of God, and nothing but the Word of God, how do you know that the translation is faithful?" (p. 101.)

In the same way that you and your Church "know" that your translation is faithful. Some of us have compared the translation with the original. The rest of us are satisfied of its substantial accuracy, because we find, not only the Church of England, by whose scholarly members and by whose authority the translation was made, and her daughter Churches, but the great body of English-speaking Protestants, though belonging to diverse and conflicting denominations, agreeing in the reception of it; and because your great champion, Milner, while *declaiming* against its accuracy, *specifies* but two passages as wrongly translated, to wit, 1 Cor. 11: 27, and St. Matt. 19: 11, neither of which bears out his charge, as I proceed to show.

In the passage from Corinthians, the question is not one of translation, but of the true *reading* in the Greek, the Manuscripts differing in regard to it; some reading *καί*, and drink, etc.; others, *ἢ*, or drink, etc.; which last, being the reading of the Sinaitic Manuscript, lately discovered, is probably, but not certainly, the true reading. Whether it be so or not, the teaching contained in it is undoubtedly true; for whosoever either eateth the bread, or drinketh the cup, unworthily, is guilty both of the body and of the blood of the Lord; not because half a sacrament is a whole sacrament, but because "whosoever shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all."

In the passage from St. Matthew, our translation, "All men *cannot* receive this saying," is *right*, and the Roman translation, "All *receive not*," is *wrong*. The Greek is οὐ πάντες χωροῦσι, *all have not the capacity for*. See the word in *Liddell & Scott*, where it is thus defined; "III. transit., *to have space or room for a thing, to hold, contain, esp. of measures.*" See the citations, one of which is translated, "as much as they possibly *could*;" literally, as much as their heads *had capacity for*.—That our translators were right, is practically admitted by the Roman translators, who render St. John 21 : 25, "the world itself, I think, *would not be able to contain* the books that should be written." Here, it is the future-infinitive of the same word which in St. Matthew is in the present indicative; if "not be able to" is right here, as unquestionably it is, "cannot" is right there. "Out of thine own mouth will I judge thee, thou wicked," or else ignorant, calumniator! Thine "End of Controversy" shall make an end of *thee*.

But I will do more than confute Milner. When I come to the chapters on Invocation of Saints, Sacred Images, Celibacy of the Clergy, and Matrimony, I will convict your version of four gross mistranslations, three of which were brought to the notice of one of your predecessors by Bishop Hopkins more than twenty years ago. See his "End of Controversy Controverted," Letter XVIII., in which also it will be seen that, as acting counsel of our English Version, he wrongly plead guilty to Milner's indictment of it. So much for translation.

"But, after having ascertained to your satisfaction that the translation is faithful, still the Scriptures can never serve as a complete Rule of Faith and a complete guide to heaven, independently of an authorized, living interpreter.

"A competent guide, such as our Lord intended for us, must have three characteristics. It must be within the reach of every one; it must be clear and intelligi-

ble ; it must be able to satisfy us on all questions relating to faith and morals. " 1st. . . . Now it is clear that the Scriptures could not at any period have been accessible to every one.

" They could not have been accessible *to the primitive Christians*, because they were not all written for a long time after the establishment of Christianity. . . . The most perfect Christians lived and died and went to heaven before the most important parts of the Scriptures were written. And what would have become of them if the Bible alone had been their guide?" (pp. 101-103.)

No one supposes that "the Bible alone" was their guide. The inspired Apostles and Evangelists were their guides. But these could not remain always on earth, and so they took care that their survivors, and all Christians to the end of time, should have their teachings "always in remembrance." (2 St. Peter 1 : 15.) How? By "having them committed to writing," says Professor Ornsby, and every sensible man says with him. But the Rhemish Annotator, not being a sensible man, or else being a knave, says it was to be accomplished by St. Peter's "intercession before God after His departure" from this life! If so, if St. Peter's intercession in heaven could bring to our *remembrance*, his teachings, though we never heard them, nor could have heard them, seeing we were not born till after his "departure," what need not only of a Bible, but what need of an infallible Church or an infallible Pope? The *inspired* Apostles and Evangelists held to no such nonsense. They took care that after their departure Christians should still have an *inspired* and, eventually, a complete guide to Christian faith and morals, which, but for the writings of the New Testament, they would not have had, the Archbishop himself being witness ; for he says, expressly, (pp. 140, 141,) "The Apostles were endowed with the gift of inspira-

tion, and we accept their writings as the revealed word of God.

"No Catholic, on the contrary, claims that the Pope is inspired, or endowed with divine revelation properly so called."

The Archbishop's argument (?) runs thus : The New Testament *wasn't* "a complete guide" to the primitive Christians, who *hadn't* it ; *therefore*, it *isn't* a complete guide to us, who *have* it ! Most lame and impotent conclusion ! And to think of its coming from an Archbishop and Metropolitan, who may be supposed, without a *very* violent presumption, to have been taught the *rudiments* of logic !

The Archbishop goes on to speak of the hard times the Christians must have had, on the "Bible alone" theory, for a thousand years and more, before the invention of printing.

"During that long period, Bibles had to be copied with the pen. There were but a few hundred of them in the Christian world, and these were in the hands of the clergy and the learned." (p. 103.)

"What has become of those millions of once famous books which were written in past ages ? They have nearly all perished. But amid this wreck of ancient literature the Bible stands almost a solitary monument, like the Pyramids of Egypt amid the surrounding wastes. That venerable volume has survived the wars and revolutions, and the barbaric invasions of fifteen centuries. Who rescued it from destruction ? The Catholic [not the Tridentine Roman] Church. Without her fostering care, the New Testament would probably be as little known to-day as 'the Book of the Days of the Kings of Israel.' III. [our I.] Kings 14 : 19." (pp. 109, 110.)

"Learned monks, who are now abused in their graves by thoughtless men, were constantly employed in copying with the pen the Holy Bible. When one died at

his post, another took his place, watching like a faithful sentinel over the treasure of God's Word." (p. 110).

From these three statements of the Archbishop, we learn that while those industrious old heathens the classic writers of antiquity, could pour forth "millions" of books, so little cared for that "they have nearly all perished," the "learned monks," with all their industry, backed by the "fostering care" of the Church, could bring the number of Bibles up only to "a few hundred;" and yet we are told, almost in the same breath,—for the sentence begins on the same page with the last-quoted statement,—that the "new translation" by St. Jerome, into Latin, "was disseminated throughout Christendom, and on that account was called the *Vulgate*, or popular edition." Were the copies so scarce, then? What says St. Augustine, as quoted by Dupin in his *History of the Canon*, vol. II. chap. iii. sect. 1, in reply to the Manichees? "What could you do but only assert that it was impossible to falsifie those Books which were *in the hands of all Christians?*" What says Dupin himself, on the preceding page? He argues that the Scriptures "were not alter'd *a little after the Death of the Apostles and Evangelists,*" because there were "copies of them spread over the face of the whole Earth; which were preserved and read *in all the Churches of Christendom.*"

To return to the Archbishop: "It was well for Luther that he did not come into the world until a century after the immortal discovery of Guttenberg." (p. 103.) Of course, it was. God always brings men into the world at the right time. Hence He brought the Archbishop into the world in the nineteenth century. Think of one so in sympathy with our "modern inventions," and "mechanical progress," (p. 78)—so enamored of "Civil and Religious Liberty," (chap. XVI.)—so hearty an abhorrer of "Religious Persecution," (p. 241)—coming into the world in the sixteenth

century ! Why, he would have been perfectly miserable !

“ A hundred years earlier, his (Luther’s) idea of directing two hundred and fifty millions of men to read the Bible would have been received with shouts of laughter.” * (p. 103.) Certainly, if he had ever had such an idea ; but, being a man of common sense, and knowing that not one in five, if indeed one in ten, of those two hundred and fifty millions, could read at all, he never had such an idea. What he actually had at heart—what he would have had at heart, had he come into the world a hundred years earlier—was that every one of those four-fifths, or nine-tenths, should have the opportunity of hearing the Scriptures publicly read in the Church, as the whole multitude of the Jews heard them read in the Synagogue, and so became familiar with them, in the time of our Lord, and as the Christians in the ages next following heard them read in their public assemblies, as is witnessed by the appointment of an *Order* of “ Readers” for that very purpose. And certainly his “ idea” of turning out the Monkish Legends from the Breviary, to make room for the Word of God, “ would have been received,” by the Authorities of the Roman Church, with anything but “ shouts of laughter.”

“ 2d. A competent guide must be clear and intelligible to all, so that every one may fully understand the true meaning of the instructions it contains. Is the Bible a book intelligible to all ? Far from it ; it is full of obscurities and difficulties not only for the illiterate, but even for the learned.” (p. 104.)

That there are hard places in Scripture nobody denies, but they are not those necessary to salvation. For instance, that about being “ baptized for the dead” (1

* This sentence and the one last cited are not original with the Archbishop ; he quotes them from Martinet’s *Religion in Society*, Vol. II. c. 10. So much the worse for Martinet.

Cor. 15 : 29) is a hard place, though doubtless it was plain to those to whom it was first addressed ; I don't understand it, and I don't expect to understand it in this life ; nor, if I did, would it set forward my salvation a hair's breadth, nor does my failure to understand it set back my salvation a hair's breadth. The " things hard to be understood," which " St. Peter himself informs us" of, " in the Epistles of St. Paul," are, as the connection shows, certain prophecies, particularly about the " times and seasons," which are purposely left in uncertainty, that we may be always *watching* for the coming of the Lord. The passage the Archbishop quotes from 2 St. Peter 1 : 20, " that no prophecy of Scripture is made by private interpretation," refers, not to the explanation of it, but to the *making* of it, as the very wording of it shows ; and if it did not, the next verse would make it plain. What the " certain man" wanted of St. Philip (Acts 8 : 31) was something to *aid* his private judgment, not to *supplant* it ; and the explanation that St. Philip gave of the prophecy commended itself to the man's private judgment, else he would not have asked to be baptized.

On this matter of the *intelligibility* of Holy Scripture, at least that part of it which pertains especially to salvation, I appeal from the Archbishop on one side of the question, to the Archbishop on the other side of the question ; for he knows how to be on both sides of the same question when it suits his argument, as we have already seen in repeated instances. After citing, on pages 87 and 88, several passages relating to the Ministry, he proceeds : " Notwithstanding these plain declarations of Scripture," etc. And again, on pages 289, 290 : " And why is the Catholic interpretation of these words [" this is My body "] rejected by Protestants ? Is it because the text is in itself obscure and ambiguous ? By no means." And yet again, on page 347 : " We have the most positive testimony, and our

Saviour's words conferring this power ["the power to forgive sins"] are expressed in the plainest language, *which admits of no misconception.*" Clearly, then, it is not the fault of the Bible, but of the heretics, who *won't* understand it right.—But why multiply instances, when every one of the three hundred and thirty-nine times that the Archbishop quotes Canonical Scripture (especially as he quotes it in almost every instance without comment) is, as I have already said, a confession, or rather, a profession, of its intelligibility, else it would be the veriest folly in him to quote it.

But let us appeal, on this point, from the Archbishop, to Scripture itself. What says the Psalmist? "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." (Ps. 119 : 105.) "I have more understanding than all my teachers : for thy testimonies are my meditation. I understand more than the ancients, because I keep thy precepts." (vv. 99, 100.) "The entrance of thy word giveth light ; it giveth understanding unto the simple." (v. 130.) What says Solomon, of the purpose for which he wrote the Proverbs? "To give subtilty to the simple, to the young man knowledge and discretion." (Prov. 1 : 4.) What says St. Luke? "It seemed good to me also. . . . to write unto thee. . . . that thou mightest *know the certainty* of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." (St. Luke 1 : 3, 4.) What says St. John? "These are written that ye might believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God ;"—how were they to believe, if they could not understand what was written?—"and that believing ye might have life through his name." (St. John 20 : 31.) What says St. Paul? "Whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning." (Rom. 15 : 4.) And so would say all the saints of the New Testament, if their sayings on this point had been preserved to us.

What say the Fathers, as reported by Dupin, (one of

the greater lights of the Gallican branch of the Roman Communion), in vol. I. chap. IX. sect. III. of his *History of the Canon*? I appeal to them especially because the Archbishop says (p. 105) they “are unanimous in pronouncing the Bible a book full of knotty difficulties,” and because this allegation, if it is to the purpose for which he advances it, means that the Fathers were opposed to the unrestricted reading of the Bible by the common people. Nothing can be more untrue. I wish I had room for the whole of Dupin’s twenty folio pages of extracts; but I must content myself with very few and very brief specimens:

“St. Irenæus [Bishop of Lyons: born A.D. 117, died 202], in the 46th Chapter of his second Book against Heresies, declares expressly, that all the Scriptures, both Prophetical and Evangelical, may be understood by all Persons: ‘Cum itaque universæ scripturæ, et Propheticæ et Evangelicæ, in aperto, et sine ambiguitate, et similiter ab omnibus audiri possint.’ . . .

“St. Clement of Alexandria, [died A.D. 216], after he had said, in the first Book of his *Pedagogue*, Chap. 11 ‘That the Word of God is the health of our Souls:’ . . . tells us in the third Book of the same Treatise, Chap. 8. ‘That this Divine Pedagogue proposes to us all manner of Instructions,’ . . . And in Chap. 11 he frames to himself this objection: ‘But we are not all capable, you will say, of this Divine Philosophy. To which he answers thus: Are we not all capable of attaining to the true Life? . . . But, will you say again, I have not learn’d to read? If you cannot read, you have no excuse to make against hearing what shall be read to you.’ . . .

“It is known that Origen [A.D. 184–255] studied the Holy Scriptures from his Childhood, and that this was one of the things which Antiquity most extoll’d and admir’d in that great Man. For it was not then

thought [implying that in Dupin's day, 200 years ago, it *was* thought] dangerous for Laymen and Children to read the Sacred Writings. . . . It is ingratitude to God, according to this Father, and an ill requital of his kindness in condescending so far as to lisp with us, that he might teach all Men the Truths of Salvation in a way suitable to the capacity of the meanest, to pretend that none but the Wise and Learned, in the esteem of the World, may take the liberty to read the Holy Scriptures; and that Women and ignorant people are profane Persons, who should not be permitted *to enter into this Sanctuary*. This is what never came into the minds of any of the Fathers; [notwithstanding they were, according to the Archbishop, (p. 105,) "*unanimous* in pronouncing the Bible a book full of knotty difficulties;"] and Origen plainly shews us how far he was from it, when, addressing himself to all Believers without distinction, he exhorts them in these words, in his *9th Homily on Leviticus*, to read continually the Sacred Writings: 'I beseech you not to content yourselves with hearing the Word of God when it is read in the Church, but apply yourselves to it also at home, and meditate there night and day on the Law of the Lord. For Jesus Christ is present in your Houses as well as in the Church, and they that seek him, find him in all places. . . . Take the Holy Scriptures into your hands, and read them.' . . .

"St. Hilary [Bishop of Poitiers A.D. 350-367]. . . . in his Commentary on Psalm 119. 'Let us remember, says he, when we applied ourselves to read the Holy Scriptures, to find there what God requires us to do in order to please him, what a fulness of Divine Knowledge we found our narrow minds capable of receiving.' . . .

"St. Basil [Bishop of Cæsarea A.D. 370-379] speaks of the Benefit that may be got by reading the Psalms, and in general all the Holy Scriptures, in these terms:

‘All the Scriptures divinely inspired, were given by the Holy Ghost, that, being, as it were, a Magazine full of all sorts of Remedies for the cure of our Souls, EVERY ONE might find in them such as are proper for their particular Distempers.’ . . . In his 284th Letter, written to a Lady, who desired his Advice, . . . he adds: ‘If you seek your comfort in the Holy Scriptures, you will need neither me nor any other to advise you about the manner of your behaviour: For the Holy Spirit will give you all those Instructions that are necessary; he will make your way plain before you, and lead you in it by the hand.’ . . .

“St. Gregory of Nyssa [A.D. 331–395] . . . says of the Psalms, ‘Let him therefore that is melancholy, or oppressed with any great affliction, consider them as a Letter of Consolation sent to him from God. Let those who travel by Land or by Sea; who are settled in any Employment at home; and in a word all Believers, Men as well as Women, in whatever state or condition they be, sick or in health, be perswaded that they deprive themselves of a great Privilege, by neglecting the use of these Divine Songs.’ . . .

“St. Ambrose [Bishop of Milan A.D. 374–397] declares in many places the Excellency of the H. Scripture, the need we have to read it, and the benefit that Christians may reap by it. . . . He says that the Gospel of St. Luke was written to be read by all those that love God, which should be the property of all true Christians, whether learned or unlearned, of all Ages, and of all Sexes. ‘This Gospel, says he, ‘is addressed to *Theophilus*, that is, to HIM THAT LOVES GOD. If you love God, it is for you it was written. Receive the Present of an Evangelist, and what he gives you as your Friend, in token of his Affection, lay up carefully in the treasure of your Hearts. Keep this precious Trust; view it often, and read it continually and with great care.’ . . .

“ St. Jerom [A.D. 331-420] . . . writing to one of his Friends named Gaudentius, among the Counsels he gives him about the Christian Education of a young Maid committed to his care, forgets not to advise him to make her read the Holy Scriptures, (Epist. 12.) ‘ When she is seven years old,’ says he, ‘ and sensible of shame, and begins to know what she ought to conceal, and to doubt about what she should speak, make her learn by heart the Psalms ; and at twelve years of age, let her read the Books of Solomon, the Gospels, Epistles of the Apostles, and the Writings of the Prophets, being taught to value them as her greatest Treasure.’ . . .

“ St. Austin [Augustine, born A.D. 354, baptized 387, Bishop of Hippo 395-430] has spoken so many things, and in so many places, in praise of this divine study, that it would be tedious to relate all that is said of it in his Works. . . . In his 56th *Sermon of Time*, where ’tis evident he speaks to all his Hearers, without distinction either of Age or Sex : ‘ Take it,’ says he, ‘ for certain, my dear Brethren, that just as our Flesh is, when it receives Nourishment but once in many days, so are our Souls when they do not feed often upon the Word of God. . . . Continue to hear, *as you are wont*, in the Church, the reading of the Holy Scripture, AND READ IT ALSO IN YOUR HOUSES.’ [CAPITALS Dupin’s.] . . . And in the next sermon : ‘ Hear,’ says he, ‘ the Divine *Lessons* in the Church, and read them also at home.’ And in the 38th concerning the Saints : ‘ Endeavour as much as in you lies, by the help of God, to read the Divine Lessons frequently in your Houses, and hear them read in the Church, with affection and submission.’ . . . And in his first *Sermon* on the 36th *Psalms*, having said, that God warns us, that Repentance, which may be performed to purpose in this World, will avail us nothing if we put it off till death, he adds, ‘ That we should have some reason to

complain we were not warn'd of it, if the Scripture was not read in all the Earth, or if there were not *everywhere Copies of it to be bought.*' . . .

"But among all the Fathers, none has spoken more frequently, emphatically, [mark that, Most Rev. Sir ; for Dupin's "emphatically" has something to back it, while yours (p. 98) has not,] or eloquently of the usefulness of reading the Holy Scripture to all Persons, than St. Chrysostom [Bishop of Constantinople A.D. 398-407]. . . . In his second *Homily* on *St. Matthew* he says : 'Who among all you that now hear me, could repeat me a Psalm, or some other portion of Scripture, by heart, if I desir'd it of him? Not one single person. . . . But what excuse do Men make for these Enormities? I am no Monk or Solitary Person they tell me : I have a Wife and Children, and a Family to take care of. This is that which ruins all now a days, your imagining that none but Monks OUGHT TO READ THE HOLY SCRIPTURE ; whereas you are under a much greater necessity of it than they. For those who are every day exposed to so many Conflicts, and receive so many Wounds, have the greater need of Remedies.' . . .

"He begins this again more particularly in his 10th *Homily* on *St. John*, and obviates all the Excuses that Laymen, and even Tradesmen can bring to be exempted from reading the Holy Scripture : 'Before,' says he, 'I explain to you the words of the Gospel, I desire of you one thing, and pray don't refuse me ; it is no difficult task, and besides is more for your own advantage than for mine. What is it then I desire of you? That on some day of the Week, and at least on *Saturday*, you would be careful to read what I am to explain to you of the Gospel ; that you would repeat it often in your houses, that you would enquire into the meaning of it ; that you would mark what you find to be clear, what appears to be obscure, and what seems

to be inconsistent. This will be a great advantage both to you and me. . . . I know very well a great many pretend they can do no more, by reason of the publick and private Affairs that take them up. But this is the very thing which condemns them, to be so intent upon the Concernments of this World, that they cannot find time for those that are more necessary for them. . . . There are others of this slothful number, who pretend that for want of Books they cannot read the Scripture. I need not say how ridiculous it would be for rich Men to alledg this Reason : But because I find a great many poor people make use of it, I would fain ask them, whether their Poverty hinders them from getting all the Instruments belonging to their trade ? How comes it then that they are so careful, notwithstanding their Poverty, to furnish themselves with every thing necessary to their Art, and never alledg their being poor, but when the question is about buying Books, which would be so useful to them in the business of their Salvation ? But after all, if there be any so poor that they cannot by any means procure Books of the Scripture, they may learn it by attending diligently to it when it is read in the Church, and minding the Explications which are there given of it.' . . .

“ He delivers his mind yet more fully . . . in his 9th *Homily* on the *Epistle* to the *Colossians*. . . . ‘ Consider the words of this great Apostle. He does not say only, Let the Word of God be in you, but, let it dwell in you richly ; teaching and exhorting one another in all Wisdom. . . . *Look for no other Master than the Word of God, which you have in your hands.* No Man is able to teach you so well as this Divine Word. For he to whom we address ourselves for Instruction, often conceals many things, out of Vain-glory or Envy. . . . THE IGNORANCE OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE, IS THE CAUSE OF ALL OUR MISERIES. We go to War

without Arms ; how should we escape from perishing there ? It is a great help to a safe retreat out of the Battel to be well armed : But if we are not, we shall not be able to defend ourselves. Do not put upon us the whole care of your Preservation, without resolving to do any thing on your part. It's true, we are your Pastors ; and you our Sheep. But you are not like those Animals that are void of Reason, and have no power to defend themselves ; for you are rational Sheep, and ought to exercise your Reason in your own defence.'

"In the third of his four sermons concerning the poor Man *Lazarus*, who lay at the Gate of wicked *Dives* : 'I tell you,' says he, 'some days beforehand the subject I intend to treat of, that you may turn to it in your Books. . . . For I exhort you always, and will never cease exhorting you, not to content yourselves with hearing the Instructions given in this place, but to read also the *Holy Scripture* constantly at home. . . . If we are wounded every day, and make use of no Remedy, what hopes can we have of Salvation ?' Afterwards, he tells his Hearers, that if Artificers rather suffer themselves to be reduced to extreme Poverty, than sell the Tools by which they get their living ; Christians ought to be the same with respect to the Books of Scripture ; that they ought to get them at any rate, and never part with them, because the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles are to a Christian, what an Anvil and Hammer are to a Smith, viz. that whereby we reform and renew our Souls. He adds : . . . 'But how, Men will say, can we receive that benefit by the Holy Scripture we are encourag'd to hope from it, if we do not understand it ?' This is the Objection, and hear what Answer this saint makes to it : . . . 'For who,' says he, 'when he reads in the Gospel : *Blessed are the meek : Blessed are the merciful ; Blessed are the pure in heart, and*

such other things, thinks he has need of a Master to make him understand them? Any one likewise easily may understand the Prodigies, Miracles, and Histories of it. It is therefore a vain pretence Men make to justify their negligence and slothfulness, in not reading the Scripture, that it is intricate and obscure. You complain you do not understand these Holy Books. And how should you understand them, when you will not so much as be at the pains to cast your eyes upon them? Take therefore the Bible, read all its Histories, and being careful to remember what you understand of it, go over often what you find in it obscure. And if after you have read it carefully, you cannot discover the meaning of it, have recourse to one more skilful than yourselves; look for a Master who may instruct you: confer with him about that which you desire to understand, and let him know how very fond you are of his Instructions. And if God sees you thus zealous to understand his Word, he will not overlook your diligence and care. Nay if it happen'd that you could not find any one to explain to you the meaning of what you enquire into, he will reveal it to you himself. Call to mind the Eunuch of the Queen of Æthiopia: He was a Barbarian, and a Man overwhelmed with Cares and Business, and did not understand what he read. Nevertheless he did not forbear to read in his Chariot. Judg by that how constant he might be in reading the Holy Scripture at home, being so diligent at it upon a journey. And if he did not give over reading, tho' he understood not what he read, much less, undoubtedly, did he leave it off, after the Instructions he receiv'd. But that he understood not what he read, appears from Philip the Deacon's Question to him: Understandest thou what thou readest? and the Eunuch's own Answer, who was not ashamed to confess his Ignorance, in saying, "How should I, except some Man guide me?" He was willing to read, tho' he had nobody

with him to instruct him ; but his Zeal moved God to send him a Teacher : And tho' you cannot promise yourselves to have a Guide sent you miraculously as he had, are you not assured of the presence and assistance of the same Spirit that excited this holy Deacon to go to him ? I beseech you then, my dear Brethren, not to neglect the means of your Salvation. Whatsoever was written, was written for our Instruction, who live in this last Age. Reading the Holy Scripture is a mighty Fence against Sin. And it is to stand upon a steep Precipice, over a bottomless Gulf, to be ignorant of the Scriptures. 'Tis to renounce Salvation, to refuse to know anything of the Divine Laws. This is that which has brought in Heresies ; that has occasioned a corruption of Manners ; that has confounded and disordered all things. For it is impossible, I assure you it is impossible for a Man that reads the Scripture CONSTANTLY AND DILIGENTLY not to receive great benefit by it.' "

I have cited thus much of the testimony reported by Dupin, because, in this *embarras de richesses* I could not content myself with less ; and I am sure the reader who has gone along with me will rather wish I had given more, as I might easily have done, for there is five times as much behind. And even that is not all. "I might add," says Dupin, "several other places but these are sufficient to show it has been a constant Tradition of both Churches, [the Greek and the (Ante-Tri-dentine) Roman,] that reading the holy Scripture is very profitable, and that all Believers have not only always been allowed to read it, but advis'd and earnestly exhorted to do so.—Let us see," he continues, "what Objections can be made against so universal a Doctrin.

"It is not fit, say some, that ignorant People, Women, and Children should read the holy Scripture, be-

cause it contains in it Mysteries and Heights that are above them. Such are Persons of shallow understandings who may pervert the Sense of Scripture, and so run into Error. They that make this objection, seem to me to be great strangers to the Spirit of God, who teaches us by the Royal Prophet and his Son *Solomon*, that the Law of God was made *to give Wisdom to the simple and ignorant*: They are great strangers to the Spirit of our Blessed Saviour, who says, that *the Holy Spirit anointed him to preach the Gospel to the Poor; and thanks his Father that he had hid the Truths he preach'd from the Wise and Prudent, and revealed them to Babes*. They are great strangers to the Maxims of the Apostles, who assure us that JESUS CHRIST had *not called into his Primitive Church, many wise Men according to the Flesh, but chosen the most foolish in the esteem of the World to confound the Wise*. . . . If there be any obscure and difficult places in it, it is not the simple ordinarily that abuse them, but the proud and conceited. . . . So that Experience is so far from shewing us that reading the Scripture is dangerous to the simple and ignorant, that on the contrary it convinces us they are for the most part learned Men whom it has led into Error, and that the Ignorant have commonly been instructed and edified by it.

“ Another Objection is, That it's a profanation of the holy Scripture to put it into the hands of Persons unworthy of it, that is, of impure Sinners. Were this true, we must say, that JESUS CHRIST likewise profaned his Word, by addressing it to sinners and lewd Women; but he himself has answered this objection, in saying, *That they were not the whole, but the sick that had need of a Physician*. The Word of God, contain'd in the holy Scripture, is a sovereign Remedy for the cure of Sinners. And why should they be denied the use of this Remedy?

“ But some, it is pretended, will unquestionably

abuse it, as St. Peter assures us, saying, that *the unlearned and unstable in the Faith wrest the Scriptures to their own destruction.* Well ! But were there not some too that abused the preaching of JESUS CHRIST ? Was not that to many an occasion of becoming more wicked, as it was foretold of him, (St. Luke 2 : 34,) that *he shall be for the fall and rising again of many in Israel ?* This is also the fate of the Gospel, written and preach'd, read and heard. It is, as the Apostle says, (2 Cor. 2 : 16 ; 1 Cor. 1 : 18, 23,) *to some the savour of death unto death, and to others the savour of life unto life. The Word of the Cross is foolishness to them that are lost, a stumbling-block to the Jews, and folly to the Gentiles.* But did this hinder St. Paul and the rest of the Apostles from preaching the Gospel indifferently to all, Jews and Gentiles, Believers and Unbelievers, Righteous and Sinners ? No more ought the ill use that some may make of reading the holy Scripture through their own perverseness, to hinder us from advising all Men to read it, except such as we foresee will despise it, and are resolved not to understand it. And those are properly the Persons of whom JESUS CHRIST speaks, when he says, (St. Matt. 7 : 6,) *Give not that which is holy unto Dogs, nor cast Pearls before Swine.*

“ There are objected likewise some Passages of the Fathers, but few in number and misapplied. It is said that *Theodoret* relates that *St. Basil* reprov'd a Cook of the Emperor *Valens*, for taking upon him to discourse of Religion. What relation has this Story to reading the holy Scripture ? [See *Theodoret*, Ed. Bohn. p. 177.]

“ It is said also that the same *St. Basil* in his Epistle to Chilon, forbids the reading of the Old Testament ; and that *Origen*, *St. Gregory* of Nazianzen and *St. Jerome* forbid the reading of some Books of the holy Scripture to young People. . . . His words are these : *Nor neglect the lessons, especially of the New Testament ; because from the Old Testament harm often happens,*

not because the words are injurious, (nociva,) but because they who are injured have weak minds. Which cannot be understood of all the Books of the Old Testament, because he recommends in that very place the recital of the Psalms; but only of some Books, as that of the Canticles. Now nobody says that young People and weak Minds may not sometimes be dissuaded from reading some places of the Old Testament, which they cannot truly understand, and [which] consequently would be useless or dangerous to them. And therefore the Jews, as I have observed, would not have Men read the Canticles, the beginning of Genesis, the beginning and end of the Prophet Ezekiel, before they came to twenty-five or thirty years of Age. As for the beginning of Genesis, I see no reason; but for the Canticles, it is not without cause that the reading of it is deferr'd. . . . But does it thence follow that Believers ought to be forbidden to read the Bible, or all the Old Testament? The quite contrary.

“Some cite also the Author of the imperfect Work on *St. Matthew* attributed to *St. Chrysostom*, but rather *Pelagius's*. . . . This Passage also has no relation to reading the Holy Scripture. . . .

“I need not insist on a Passage of *Bede*, alledged also by some. . . . But neither is this said of reading the holy Scripture. . . .

“Lastly, Some alledg a Passage of *St. Jerom*, in his Epistle to *St. Paulinus*, where he complains that all sorts of People meddled with the holy Scripture, that silly Women, old Men, and Sophisters, presuming they understood it very well, mangled it, and took upon them to teach it before they had learn'd it; *docent antequam discant*. But it is a manifest abuse of these words of *St. Jerom*, to understand them barely of reading the holy Scripture.”

Certainly, it is. No man has a right to teach—no man can teach—till he has learned; but the very way to learn, is to read.

I add two more sentences of St. Augustine, taken from the 2d Section of the next Chapter of Dupin's Work: "This St. Austin observes in his second *Book of the Christian Doctrine*, Chap. 9. 'The Precepts,' says he, 'relating to a good Life, and the Truths necessary to be believed, are clearly contained in the holy Scripture.' And in his Letter to Volusian, 'The things, says he, necessary to salvation, and the Faith without which we cannot live virtuously, are not hard to find in the Scripture.' St. Chrysostom says the same in several places."

One word more about the "things hard to be understood" in the Epistles of St. Paul. In the very same breath in which St. Peter speaks of these "things," he tells those to whom he is writing, that one of those Epistles was written to *them*. What was it written to them for, if they were not to read it, or to hear it read? The fact is that nearly all the Epistles are addressed to some one or more Churches; not merely, or chiefly, to the clergy, but to the laity, the Christian men and women *and children* (Eph. 6 : 1 ; Col. 3 : 20), "high and low, rich and poor, one with another :

"Paul a servant of Jesus Christ"—"To all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints."—"Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, to them that are sanctified in Christ Jesus, called to be saints, *with all that in every place* call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord, both theirs and ours"—"Unto the church of God which is at Corinth, with all the saints which are in all Achaia"—"Unto the churches of Galatia"—"To the saints which are at Ephesus, and to the faithful in Christ Jesus"—"To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons"—"To the saints and faithful brethren in Christ which are at Colosse"—"Unto the church of the Thessalonians which is in God the Father, and in the Lord Jesus Christ"—"James, a servant of God and of the Lord

Jesus Christ, to the twelve tribes which are scattered abroad, greeting"—“ Peter, an apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia.”

In all but three of these the salutation is, expressly, and in those three, by implication, not to the corporate body of the Church, but to the individual members. What right, then, has the Church, or any portion of it, in its corporate capacity, to keep back any part of the precious deposit with which it has been put in trust—the inspired written tradition—from those to whom it is addressed? Did not the Apostle expect *as a matter of course* that the Epistle to the Romans would be read among the Romans, notwithstanding the hard things in it—harder than in any of the others; the Epistles to the Corinthians among the Corinthians; the Epistle to the Ephesians among the Ephesians, etc.; and was it not his *intention* that these Epistles, as also all the others, should be read beyond their several immediate spheres? and did he not, therefore, taking the first for granted, in writing to the Colossian Christians make provision for the second (Col. 4 : 16) by charging them “ When this epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the church of the Laodiceans; and that ye likewise read the epistle from Laodicea?” And is not one of his Epistles in one of the passages already cited, expressly addressed not merely to the Corinthian Christians, but to “ *all that in every place call upon the name of Jesus Christ our Lord?*” Nay, did not the Apostle, in the very first epistle he ever wrote, as if in prophetic anticipation of what has since come to pass, say to the Thessalonian Christians (1 Thes. 5 : 27), “ I charge you (*ὁρκίζω*, I adjure you) by the Lord that this Epistle be read unto all the holy brethren?” And if the Epistles, much more the Gospels, and the Acts of the Apostles, which are less “ hard to be understood.” Really, it is to me simply astounding that a

Church that claims to be the mother and mistress of all Churches, should thus go in the very teeth of the teaching of an Apostle whom she claims as one of her founders !

My indictment against her is not that she gives milk to babes, but that it is not the "milk of the Word" that she gives to them ; at any rate, not the "sincere * milk of the Word," (1 St. Peter 2 : 2,) and that, in consequence, they do not "grow thereby," but are kept in perpetual minority, and that minority made the pretext for the perpetual withholding of strong meat from them, thereby laying them open to the Apostolic reproof, (Heb. 5 : 12,) "When for the time ye ought to be teachers, ye have need that one teach you again which be the first principles of the oracles of God." The object, as of St. Luke's Gospel, (1 : 4,) so of all the other Gospels, and indeed of the whole New Testament, is that *all* Christians may know the certainty of those things wherein they have been catechized. The office of the Catechism is to prepare the way for the Bible, not to take the place of it. "Whom shall he teach knowledge, and whom shall he make to understand doctrine? Them that are weaned from the milk, and drawn from the breasts." (Isa. 28 : 9.) What the Apostle says of the man and the woman, (1 Cor. 11 : 11,) may with equal propriety be said of the Bible and the Church. Neither is the Church without the Bible, nor the Bible without the Church. Each is the complement of the other ; intended to be so by the Divine Author of both ; and what God has joined together let not man put asunder.

Thus much of the Archbishop's second "characteristic :'' I pass to the third.

"3. A rule of Faith, or a competent guide to heaven,

* *Sine cera*, without wax ; originally applied to pure honey, and afterwards to any unadulterated substance.

must be able to instruct in all the truths necessary for salvation. Now . . . is not every Christian obliged to sanctify Sunday? . . . But you may read the Bible from Genesis to Revelation, and you will not find a single line authorizing the sanctification of Sunday." (p. 108.)

What says St. Paul? "One man esteemeth one day above another: another esteemeth every day alike. Let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind." (Rom. 14 : 5.) If this is not an *authorization* of it, no conceivable language could authorize it. But perhaps the Archbishop meant *requiring*? Why didn't he say so, then? But *is* there nothing, "from Genesis to Revelation," *requiring* it? Let us see. The *Jewish Sabbath*, as a part of the "ministration of death, written and engraven in stones," (2 Cor. 3 : 7,) is "done away," and we are thrown back by the "Son of Man," who is "Lord even of the Sabbath day," (St. Matt. 12 : 8,) on the original institution (Gen. 2 : 3) of a weekly cessation from labor, one day in seven, "sanctified," that is, set apart, for that purpose. The "disciples," therefore, must have "sanctified" some one day of the week. What day did they sanctify? What but the "first day of the week, when," as we read, (Acts 20 : 7,) they "came together to break bread"—the only day, so far as we are informed, on which they did come together for that purpose?—the day on which the Lord rose from the dead—on which He went with two of the Disciples to Emmaus, and "was known of them in breaking of bread"—on which He "breathed on" the Apostles, and said, "Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (St. Luke 24 : 1, 13, 15, 30, 31, 35 ; St. John 20 : 19-23)—the day on which the Apostle ordered the weekly "collection for the saints (1 Cor. 16 : 1, 2,) to be made in "the churches of Galatia," and the church at Corinth and "in all Achaia" (2 Cor. 1 : 1,)—in short, "the Lord's day," (Rev. 1 : 10,) the day on which the

Seer of Patmos "was in the Spirit"—for, what conceivable reason could there be for calling any other day of the week the Lord's day? and what conceivable reason could there be for calling *that* the Lord's day,* unless it had been "sanctified," *i.e.*, set apart from the other days of the week. The truth is, we have taken, not only the day, but the very name of it—its *Christian* name—from the Bible. The Archbishop should read his Bible more carefully; it isn't half so meagre as he supposes.

"The Catholic Church correctly teaches that our Lord and His Apostles inculcated certain important duties of religion which are not recorded by the inspired writers. (See John 21 : 25 ; 2 Thess. 2 : 14.) For instance, most Christians pray to the Holy Ghost, a practice which nowhere is found in the Bible." (p. 108.)

What has the allegation in the last sentence to do with the allegation in the first? The question is not whether the "practice" is "found," but whether the "duty" is "inculcated." If it is not, then comes up the question, first, whether it *is* a duty, and if it is, then, secondly, whether the duty *needs* inculcating.

The Archbishop will not deny that it is a right, and that the right is sanctioned by the Bible; for if the Holy Ghost be God, as well as the Father, and the Son, and if it is right to pray to the Father separately, and to the Son separately, it follows that it is right to pray to the Holy Ghost separately. As to St. John xxi. 25, the Evangelist does *not* say (what the Archbishop, by citing him in this connection, makes him say) that among the "things which Jesus did," and which are not written, was the inculcation of "certain important duties of religion." In 2 Thess. 2 : 14

* The day of judgment is called in Scripture the "day of the Lord;" but the phrase in the Greek is entirely different from that in Rev. i. 10, rendered, the "Lord's day."

[our 15], the Apostle, in the exhortation, "hold the traditions which ye have been taught, whether, by word or our epistle," does indeed imply, that there were "certain important" teachings of his, whether "duties," or doctrines, "of religion," which were "not recorded" in his First Epistle to them; but he does *not* imply (what the Archbishop represents him as implying) that those teachings would not be found "recorded," every one of them, in some part or other of the New Testament, when it should have been completed. The Archbishop's reasoning is, "Certain important duties of religion" are not "recorded" in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians, *therefore*, they are not recorded in the New Testament!

Having thus examined the alleged "difficulties" (p. 100) in the way of taking the Bible as the Standard of Appeal, and shown that they exist only in the fertile imagination of the Archbishop, let us now turn the tables, and see how these difficulties affect the Archbishop's own Standard, the Church.

The *first* difficulty in the way of the non-Roman inquirer is a very serious one, to wit, Which *is* the Church? For there are several claimants with conflicting claims, in whole, or in part. For instance; there is the Roman Church, which claims to be the whole, and there is, to mention no other, the Greek Church, which claims to be a part. Before he can advance another step, he must decide between these claims; for before the infallibility of the Church can be an authority to him, he must know which is the infallible Church,—the *whole* Church; since for nothing less than the whole Church is infallibility even claimed. Now there is no such difficulty in regard to the Bible; for, in the first place, there is but one Book that even claims to be the New Testament; and, in the second place, there is but one Old Testament recognized in the New, to wit, that authenticated

by our Lord in St. Luke xxiv. 44: "All things must be fulfilled, which were written in the Law of Moses, and in the Prophets, and in the Psalms, concerning me;" on which Professor Ornsby, in his edition of the Greek Testament, "from Cardinal Mai's Edition of the Vatican Bible," published with the "Approbation" of Cardinal Cullen, Dublin, 1865, has the following Note: "A threefold division of the O. T. *in use among the Hebrew Jews* (*italics mine*); the first comprising the Pentateuch; the second, the Prophets, including Joshua, Judges, Ruth, and Kings [including Samuel]; the third, called also Hagiographa, in which were included the Psalms, Job, the works of Solomon, the books of Paralipomena [*i.e.*, Chronicles], Daniel, Esdras [*i.e.*, Ezra and Nehemiah], and Esther. Cf. Abp. Dixon's Gen. Intr. to the S. Scr. I. p. 60."—In other words, the Books of the *Hebrew* canon, as we have them in our English Bibles; there being not a single recognition, throughout the New Testament, of any of the Apocryphal Books.—This first "difficulty" then is altogether against the Church, as a practical Standard of Appeal, as compared with the Bible.

How is it as to the *second* difficulty—that respecting *Translation*. The authoritative teaching of the Roman Church is in Latin, and must therefore be translated, at least for the common people. How is the inquirer to know that the translation is faithful? There is at least equal difficulty," on this point, in the way of the Church, as in the way of the Bible.

We come to the *third* difficulty: A standard of Appeal "must be within reach of every inquirer after truth," The Bible *is* within reach of all; for even those who cannot read it, can hear it read, and be reasonably sure that it is read to them correctly. Is it so with the teaching of the Roman Church? What is that teaching, and where is it to be found? What says the Creed of Pope Pius? Its last article runs

thus : " I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils, and particularly by the Holy Synod of Trent." Where are these deliverances, definitions, and declarations, to be found ? In some three-score folio volumes !

How is it with the *fourth* difficulty A Standard of Appeal " must be clear and intelligible to all." Do those folios come under that category ? He must be a bold man who would put them on a par with the Bible on the score of intelligibility.

The *fifth* and *last* difficulty respects *completeness*. And here the Roman Church has absolutely nothing but what she gets from the Bible ; for her claim to the possession of an unwritten tradition has nothing to stand on ; the supposition that God would take up large portions of the Bible with things not necessary to salvation, to the exclusion of things necessary, leaving to the latter the proverbial uncertainty of unwritten tradition, while to the former is secured the comparative certainty of written tradition, refutes itself.

" God forbid that any of my readers should be tempted to conclude, from what I have said, that the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church is opposed to the reading of the Scriptures." (p. 109.) " If you open an English Catholic [meaning Roman] Bible, you will find in the preface a letter of Pope Pius VI., in which he strongly recommends the pious reading of the Holy Scriptures." (p. 111.)

Yes, and " if you open" even the New Testament, published by Lucas Brothers with the " Approbation" of " JAMES, Archbishop of Baltimore," " you will find" immediately preceding this " letter of Pope Pius" an " Admonition," in the second paragraph of which you may read as follows : " To prevent and remedy this *abuse*, [wresting the Scriptures, 2 St. Peter 3 : 16,] and to guard against *error*, it was judged necessary to for-

bid the reading of the Scriptures in the vulgar languages, [the languages of the common people,] without the advice and permission of the Pastors and Spiritual Guides whom God has appointed to *govern his Church.*"

Why had not the Archbishop the manliness to tell his non-Roman readers this? And why did not he tell them, further, that one of the "Rules" in the *Index* of "bad and pernicious Books" set forth, in compliance with the direction of the Council of Trent, by Pius IV., (See Dupin, *History of the Canon*, Vol. I. chap. IX. sect. IV. par. 14,) was as follows :

"It being therefore evident from Experience, that if the Bible translated into the Vulgar Tongue was allowed to all Persons indifferently, the rashness of Men would cause it to do more harm than good : We decree upon this consideration, that the Matter be referred to the Judgment of a Bishop or Inquisitor, who with the advice of a Curate or Confessor, may give those leave to read the Bible in a known Tongue, [Rome has no objection to their reading it in an *unknown* Tongue—none whatever,] translated by Catholic Authors, to whom they judg such reading will not be prejudicial, but rather promote their Faith and Piety ; *and such are to have this Permission in Writing.*"

Dupin thinks that the "supposition" on which the "Prohibition" is "grounded" being "groundless," since "it is universally known, that among a thousand Catholics who read the Holy Scripture in a known Tongue at present, there is hardly one to whom it does more harm than good," "the Prohibition ought to cease." But the question is not what *ought* to be, but what *is* ; and the Archbishop knows very well what is, but he doesn't mean that his readers shall know, if he can help it : "God forbid that any of my readers should be tempted to conclude, from what I have said, that the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church is op-

posed to the reading of the Scriptures.”—*Will God forbid it?* I trow not.

“For right is right, since God is God,
And right the day must win.”

God is never on the side of the suppression of truth and the involved suggestion of falsehood.

“It is often triumphantly said . . . that the first edition of the Bible ever published after the invention of printing, was the edition of Martin Luther.” (p. 111.)

Why doesn’t the Archbishop give the name of the *ignoramus* who “said” it so “often,” and so “triumphantly?” Simply because he can’t.

“The fact is, that before Luther put his pen to paper, no fewer than fifty-six editions of the Scriptures had appeared on the continent of Europe, not to speak of those printed in Great Britain . . . twenty-one in German; one in Spanish; four in French; twenty-one in Italian; five in Flemish, and four in Bohemian.” (p. 111.)

Yes, and the further fact is, that *after* Luther put his pen to paper, and “his idea of directing two hundred and fifty millions of men to read the Bible,” or *hear it read*, was working itself rapidly into the public mind and heart, so far was it from being “received with shouts of laughter,” that it created a perfect panic in the Roman Camp, the result of which was the Papal Prohibition above-quoted. Up to this time, mediæval Rome had contented herself with making the Bible take a back seat in the synagogue, and promoting monkish legends to the post of honor; but now the emergency called for vigorous measures of repression. The *infection* was spreading, and nothing short of a rigid quarantine could keep it out; hence the Prohibition.

“You will also find in Haydock’s Bible the letters of the Bishops of the United States, in which they express

the hope that this splendid edition would have a wide circulation among their flocks."

Exactly so. Rome has no fear of the "splendid editions," which none but the well-to-do can purchase, and which are kept for show, not for use. What she fears is, the cheap editions, the ten-cent Testaments and twenty-five or fifty-cent Bibles, that are within reach of the sons of toil.

"A gentleman of North Carolina lately informed me that the first time he entered a [so-called] Catholic bookstore, he was surprised at witnessing on the shelves an imposing array of Bibles for sale. Up to that moment he had believed the [not] unfounded charge that [vast numbers of so-called] Catholics were forbidden to read the Scriptures. He has since embraced [what he has been deluded into believing] the Catholic faith." (p. 112.)

One so *innocent* as not to know that in Protestant countries Rome is compelled by the exigences of the situation to make at least a show of circulating the Bible, was just the fly to be caught in such a cobweb. The "array" he "witnessed," was "imposing" in more than one sense of the word; it imposed on *him*! How is it in those countries where Rome bears undisputed sway? How is it in South America? How is it in the South of Europe, particularly in Spain? How was it before the recent establishment of responsible constitutional government, in the Eternal City? Let the following, which I take from the *Southern Churchman* of September 20th, 1878, answer the question. The writer is known all over the United States, and extensively in other lands, as one who would *scorn* a suppression of truth, or suggestion of falsehood. What he says may be relied on:

"When I was in Rome, nearly twenty-five years ago, it was not possible to find a Bible in a bookstore,

and its circulation in the Papal States was prohibited. Now it is as freely sold, distributed, and read as in any other country. In my room at the hotel Quirinal, and in each room of this, the largest hotel in the city, is a copy of the Bible in the English language—a large octavo, gilt-edged and handsomely bound Oxford Bible! Such a copy in New York would cost \$2.50 or more. An agent of the British and Foreign Bible Society resides in Rome and attends to the distribution of the Scriptures in hotels, institutions, and wherever it will be received. Colporteurs are employed to go about the country and cities. One of them will be fitted out with a horse and cart, the cart being so constructed as to be converted by night into a bed chamber for the colporteur to sleep in. He goes into a city, gets a license to sell his books in the market-place, draws a crowd around him, reads the Gospel, and sells the truth, or gives it away if he thinks it wisest to do so.”—*Rev. Dr. Prime, in N. Y. Observer.*

“Every priest is obliged in conscience to devote upwards of an hour each day to the perusal of the Word of God. I am not aware that clergymen of other denominations are bound by the same duty.” (p. 113.)

We “peruse the Word of God” not because we are “obliged in conscience” to it, but because it is our meat and drink; because we are “as glad of” it “as one that findeth great spoil;” (Ps. 119 : 162 ;) and the consequence is, that we “hate and abhor lying.” (vs. 163.)

“What is good for the clergy is good also for the laity.” (p. 113.)

There, for once, the Archbishop is right; but he flies in the face of Pope Pius IV., of blessed memory.

“Be assured that if you become a Catholic [so called], you will never be forbidden to read the Bible.” (p. 113.)

Probably not ; for in this Protestant land Rome accepts the situation, and lets her proselytes read the Scripture. But then, if you read it, you must read it of favor, and not of right ; and you must have a written license for it, else you will be following the example of the Archbishop, flying in the face of Pope Pius IV., and no one who does that, can be “ a good Catholic.”—Moreover, you must confine yourself to the Roman Version, which is itself a translation of a translation, and not by any means as English as it might be. For instance, Heb. 13 : 16, in the Translation as it was “ first published by the English College of Rheims” Anno 1582 : “ And beneficence and communication do not forget, for with such hosts God is promerited.” It is fair to say that the Revision now in use is a very decided advance upon this ; but there is plenty of room yet for improvement. For instance, Col. 2 : 18 ; “ Let no man seduce you, willing in humility and religion of angels ;”—2 Cor. 5 : 14 : “ For the charity of Christ presseth us ;”—St. Matt. 16 : 23 : “ Go after me, Satan ;” a thing that Satan is only too happy to do.—And then in the matter of *rhythmic flow*, in the poetical portions ; the *Nunc Dimittis* of Simeon, (St. Luke 2 : 29,) for instance : “ Now thou dost dismiss thy servant, O Lord, according to thy word, in peace ;” as contrasted with our Version : “ Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace, according to thy word.”—That must be a dull ear indeed on which the halting prose of the former does not grate, or which does not drink in with delight the marvellous melody of the latter. Only they to whom our English Bible has been a household companion from their infancy, but who have gone from us, in after life, in the vain hope of a rest that cannot be found this side of paradise, can tell how deep the descent, how “ steep-down” the “ gulf !” Listen to the wail of one of them (Newman (?), or Faber (?),) in the *Dublin Review*, and then, make the plunge—if you can :

“Who will not say that the uncommon beauty and marvellous English of the Protestant Bible is one of the great strongholds of heresy in the country? It lives on the ear like a music that can never be forgotten; like the sound of church bells which the convert hardly knows how he can forego. Its felicities often seem to be almost things rather than mere words. It is part of the national mind, and the anchor of national seriousness. The memory of the dead passes into it. The potent traditions of childhood are stereotyped in its verses. The power of all the griefs and trials of man is hidden beneath its words. It is the representative of his best moments, and all that has been about him of soft, and gentle, and pure, and penitent, and good, speaks to him out of his English Bible. It is his sacred thing; which doubt has never dimmed and controversy never soiled. In the length and breadth of the land there is not a Protestant with one spark of religiousness about him, whose spiritual biography is not in the Saxon Bible.”

CHAPTER IX.

THE PRIMACY OF PETER.

“BEFORE coming to any direct proofs on this subject,” says the Archbishop, “I may state that in the Old Law, the High Priest, appointed by Almighty God, filled an office analogous to that of Pope in the New Law.” (p. 114.)

The Jewish Church was a National Church, and a National Church must have an administrative organization, and therefore an administrative head; and so the National or Provincial Churches, of which the Catholic Church of Christ is made up, have, and have had all

along, each its administrative head. But the Catholic Church itself, the *whole* Church, has not, and never has had, an administrative head, for the simple reason that it has no need of one; just as the Masonic Fraternity, which is as visible and as catholic a body as the Christian Church, has, as I have already remarked, national administrative heads, but no ecumenical head. And answer to what the Archbishop says about "every well-regulated government," and this is my "every well-ordered family." This last analogy, to be to the point, would have required not only that Noah should rule his wife, and his sons and their wives, as long as they were with him in the Ark, but that when they came forth of it, and set up for themselves, "and begat sons and daughters," he should continue to have the administrative headship, and should transmit the succession to his heirs male forever. If this system were now to be universally adopted and carried out, it needs no prophet to tell that, in two or three generations, the *genus* "well-ordered family" would be extinct.

"Now the Jewish synagogue, as St. Paul testifies, was the type and figure of the Christian Church; for 'all things happened to them (the Jews) in figure.' (1 Cor. 10: 11.) We must, therefore, find in the Church of Christ a spiritual judge, exercising the same supreme authority as the High Priest in the Old Law." (p. 115.)

The Apostle says, not only in the original Greek, and in our English Version, but in the Latin Vulgate, in the Rhemish Version, and in the Archbishop's Version, * "all *these* things;" namely, the things he had been speaking of in the ten preceding verses, to wit, the passage of the Red Sea by the Israelites, and their

* I so designate, for brevity's sake, the edition published by Lucas Brothers, with the approbation of Abp. Whitefield.

wanderings, and murmurings, and transgressions in the Wilderness, all which happened hundreds of years before there was a synagogue in the land. But the Archbishop leaves out the word "these," and thus *creates* a Scripture proof that the supreme spiritual judgship of the High Priest in the Old Law, was a type and figure of a like supreme spiritual judgship in the Christian Church. Sad, very sad !

"The body and members of the Church are visible ; why not also the Head ? The Church without a supreme Ruler would be . . . like a human body without a head." (p. 116.)

The "body and members of the Church" are *not* "visible," but only a *part* of the "body and members"—a very small part ; by far the larger part, along with the Head, has passed out of sight—but not out of existence. The Church on earth and in paradise is one ; and it has but one Head, even Christ. The Archbishop's comparison of it to "a human body" would imply that if a man were going up through a hole in the ceiling, and his head and shoulders had got out of sight, his body would no longer have a head !

"The absence from the Protestant Communions," says the Archbishop, (p. 117,) "of a divinely-appointed, visible head, is to them an endless source of weakness and dissensions. [Yet, sad as these dissensions are, they are, at least, signs of *life*.] . . .

"The existence, on the contrary, of a supreme judge of controversy in the Catholic [meaning Roman] Church, is the secret of her admirable unity." Just as the existence of a "supreme judge of controversy" in Barnum's "happy family" is "the secret" (and both of them are "*open secrets*") of *its* "admirable unity"; a unity as "admirable," and (I may add) as *valuable*, in the one as in the other. The *animals* have learned by experience that any exhibition, on their part, of dog nature and fox nature, of cat nature and rat nature,

etc., will bring down on their devoted heads the pastoral *crook* of the keeper. So they repress the outward manifestation of their God-given instincts ; *but*—they keep up a terrible *thinking*.

Having thus cleared away the preliminary (*prælimen*, before the threshold) *rubbish*, we come at last to the question at issue, "Have we any positive proof that Christ did appoint a supreme Ruler over His Church?" Yes, says the Archbishop, we have it in St. Matthew 16 : 13-19, "Thou art Peter, and on this rock," etc. "The word *Peter*, in the Syro Chaldaic tongue, which our Saviour spoke, means *a rock*. The sentence runs in that language : '*Thou art a rock, and on this rock I will build my Church.*' Indeed, all respectable Protestant commentators have now abandoned, and even ridicule, the absurdity of applying the word *rock* to any one but to Peter ; as the sentence can bear no other construction, unless our Lord's good grammar and common sense are called in question." (p. 119.)

This is rather rough on Cyprian, and Jerome, and Chrysostom, and Cyril of Alexandria, and Ambrose, and Hilary, and Augustine, all of whom, as the Archbishop very well knows, agree in making something other than Peter the rock ; some of them making it Christ, and some of them Peter's Confession of Christ, Peter's Faith ; though some of them, at other times, make it Peter himself.—But let that pass. I am not here concerned with their interpretation, for they are all off the track, as are also all the modern commentators that I have consulted ; and they are not few. It may seem presumptuous in me to say this, and I might hesitate, were it not that hardly any two of them *fully* agree in their interpretation.

Our Lord did not say to Peter, "Thou art *a* rock," but, "Thou art rock," or, "Thou art stone ;" for it makes no difference, so far as the meaning *here* is con-

cerned, which word we adopt. Had our Lord said, "Thou art rock, and on rock I will build my Church," the commentators would have seen their way clear to the true interpretation. But they have been led off the track by the demonstrative "this;" all agreeing in supposing it employed here to individualize some particular rock from all other rocks, whereas it is employed simply to individualize the *substance* rock, the *material* rock, from all other *substances*, all other *materials*; just as the definite article "the" is employed in the Greek of St. Matthew 7 : 24-26,—*built his house upon THE rock—upon THE sand*—not to individualize any particular rock from all other rocks, or any particular sand from all other sand, but to individualize, in the one case the *substance* "rock," in the other the *substance* "sand," from all other *substances*.

This is a recognized use of the demonstrative pronoun. For instance : This goloid that they are making jewelry of, is poor stuff. "As for this Moses . . . we wot not what is become of him." (Exod. 32 : 1.) "May give an account of this concourse." (Acts 19 : 40.) That is, this goloid, as contrasted not with other goloid, but with other metals; this Moses, as contrasted not with some other Moses, but with other men; this concourse as contrasted not with some other concourse, but with our ordinary quiet—this coming excitedly together, instead of staying at home, and minding our own business. So in the Archbishop's book, (p. 50,) "This Catholicity," as contrasted not with other Catholicity, but with non-Catholicity.

This use, then, of the demonstrative is clear, and it is perfectly applicable to the passage we are considering : "Thou art Peter, (that is rock, not sand, or clay,) and on this (material, this substance,) rock, (not on sand, or, on clay,) I will build my Church." The only difficulty is, that the name Peter having no significance in our language, we can't preserve the play upon the

words, as the French, the Spanish, and the Italian languages can. But there is a passage of Scripture that will help me to illustrate this play of words in such a way as will, I think, enable those whose only language is English to understand and appreciate it. In Revelation 21 : 14, 19, we read : " And the wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb. . . . The first foundation was jasper." Now as Peter was the first Apostle, his name would be in the first foundation. Moreover Jasper, in English, is a Christian name. Philadelphians are familiar with the name of Jasper Harding, the former proprietor of the *Inquirer*. Suppose, then, Our Lord's language had been English, and that He had named His apostle Jasper, and had said to him, " Thou art Jasper, and on this jasper I will build my Church," we should see at once that He did not mean, " Thou art *a* Jasper, a particular Jasper, and on this particular jasper I will build my Church," but that He meant just what He said, Thou art Jasper, and on this jasper (this material, this substance, jasper) I will build my Church. Suppose you see a group of persons bearing the respective names, Stone, Marble, Clay, and, wishing to communicate with the first, you call to him, Stone !—If you are thinking at all of the significance of his name, you are thinking of it, not as distinguishing him from other stones, but, as distinguishing him from marble, and clay ; for if the others also were named Stone, it *wouldn't* distinguish him from them, and if you wanted to distinguish him from them, you would make use of some other name for the purpose. Hence, there being two Simons in the apostolic college, our Lord, on the occasion we are considering, added to the name Simon, the distinguishing designation, Bar-jona, *i.e.*, Son of Jonas. But " Peter" *was* a distinguishing designation, distinguishing him who bore it, not from other Peters, but from

the other Apostles ; he alone being, in name, and, perhaps, in some measure, in quality, (not *the* substance, but) *of* the substance, on which the Church was to be built.

But why did St. Matthew, in translating our Lord's words from Syro-Chaldaic (if indeed, as is probable, they were spoken in that tongue) into Greek, translate Kephas in the first clause by *Petros*, STONE, and in the last clause by *Petra*, ROCK ? For the simple reason that, while preserving the play upon the words, (since—contrary to what is the case in English, where, the two words being from different roots, we can say a stone church, but not a rock church—in Greek, *petros* and *petra*, being from the same root *petr*, will, *both*, designate the material) he would thus exhibit Peter, not as the foundation Rock, but, as a foundation stone, to be (in the fulness of time) “laid” on the foundation Rock *already* “lying,” *κείμενον* (1 Cor. 3 : 11,) “which is Jesus Christ.” It is remarkable that Simeon, in the temple, (St. Luke 2 : 34,) uses the same word : “Behold, this (as yet, child) *κείμεται*, *lieth*, (not, “is set,”) *i.e.*, as a foundation, “for the fall and rising of many in Israel ;” the fall of some, the rising of others. “The image,” says Abp. Kenrick, as quoted by Prof. Ornsby *in loc.*, “is that of a rock against which some stumble and fall, whilst others rise on it.” It is still more remarkable that the same word is used by St. Paul (2 Thess. 2 : 4) as the designation of the Man of Sin, *ὁ ἀντικείμενος*, *he that lieth (as a foundation) in antagonism to*, and exalteth himself *against*, the One Foundation.—See Wordsworth, *in loc.*

St. Peter, then, was a foundation stone, built upon the Foundation Rock ; but so was every one of the Twelve : “The wall of the city had twelve foundations, and in them the names of the twelve Apostles of the Lamb.” (Rev. 21 : 14.)

But our Lord goes on : “I will give unto thee the

keys of the kingdom of heaven.” The nature and extent of the power here *promised*—for it is not yet *conferred*—is shown in the sentence immediately following: “And whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.” (St. Matt. 16: 19.) Was this power to be restricted to St. Peter? The Archbishop himself shall answer: “And to all the Apostles assembled together on another occasion, He uses (St. Matt. 18: 18) the same forcible language: ‘Whatsoever you (ye) shall bind on earth shall be bound also in heaven, and whatsoever you (ye) shall loose on earth shall be loosed also in heaven.’” (p. 347.)

What this power of the keys was, I shall consider when I come to the Chapter on Penance. At present I am concerned with it only so far as it bears upon the “Primacy of Peter,” and to that extent it was exercised by him, once for all so far as the Jews were concerned, when he opened the kingdom of heaven to them on the day of Pentecost; once for all, so far as the Gentiles were concerned, when He opened the kingdom of heaven to them in the person of Cornelius and his household. That was the whole extent of His primacy in the matter of the *keys*; it gave him no *authority* whatever over his fellow Apostles, nor did they, or he, ever suppose it did. At the opening of the very next chapter but one, we are told that the Disciples came to Jesus with the question, “Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven? If they had known as much about it as the Archbishop, in the first place, they wouldn’t have come to the Lord with the question; and in the second place, if they had come He would have answered them, “Why, Peter is the greatest, *of course*. Didn’t you hear me tell him so the other day?” But instead of that, He calls a little child unto Him, and sets him in the midst of them; and

from that text preaches to them a sermon on humility. But this sermon seems to have made but little impression on two of them ; for we read, only two chapters further on, that the mother of Zebedee's children, or, as St. Mark relates it, (10 : 35,) Zebedee's children themselves, came to Him with the request that they might sit, the one on His right hand, and the other on His left, in His kingdom. " And when the ten (of whom Peter was one) heard it, they were moved with indignation against the two brethren ;" not because the *two* were showing disrespect to the primacy of the *one*, but because they were conspiring against the equality of the *twelve*.

So much for the "*Promise of the Primacy.*" We come now to what the Archbishop calls the "*Fulfilment of the Promise.*" And where, reader, think you, does he find that fulfilment? Where but in St. John 21 : 15-17?—"Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me? Feed my lambs—Feed my sheep." "Peter," says the Archbishop, "has jurisdiction not only over the lambs,—the weak and tender portion of the flock,—by which are understood the faithful ; but also over the sheep, *i.e.*, the Pastors themselves." (p. 121.) In place of the Latin word *Pastor*, in the above, put the Saxon word *Shepherd*, and the bull (both Papal and Irish) of turning sheep into shepherds will confront the reader's risibles, and affront his reason. The simple and obvious meaning of the command—obvious to any one of plain common sense—is, "Feed the little ones of the flock—feed the grown-up ones ;" "little ones" and "grown-up ones" being both of them taken both in the literal and in the spiritual sense ; and the command is confined to Peter, because Peter is specially in need of it, as having been specially delinquent ; and it is thrice repeated because he has thrice denied his Master.—Feed the several members of my flock. Feed them "with food convenient for them ;" the little ones

with "the sincere milk of the word,"* (1 St. Peter 2 : 2,) that they "may grow thereby;" the grown-up ones (spiritually) with "strong meat," that they may not be "unskilful in the word of righteousness." (Heb. 5 : 13, 14.) Rome counts all her laity lambs, as contradistinguished from sheep, and accordingly feeds them with milk; but not (as I have already remarked) with the milk of the word; at any rate, not with the *sincere* milk of the word, but with adulterated milk; and the consequence is that they do not grow thereby, but are kept, as she means them to be kept, in perpetual non-age. "Brethren, be not children in understanding: howbeit in malice be ye children, but in understanding be men." (1 Cor. 14 : 20.)

The "*Fulfilment of the Promise*," then, is not to be found in the injunction to Peter, "Feed my lambs"—"my sheep," but in the Commission, in the preceding chapter, as to Peter so also to the other Apostles: "Receive ye the Holy Ghost: Whose soever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever sins ye retain, they are retained." The nature and extent of this power we are not here concerned with; it will come up for consideration in the chapter on Penance.

We come lastly to what the Archbishop calls the "*Exercise of the Primacy*." Of this he gives several instances, or what he takes to be instances. But first he calls our attention to the fact that "Peter's name always stands first in the lists of the Apostles," and that he "is even called by St. Matthew *the first Apostle*." (p. 122.) This is undoubtedly true, and it as undoubtedly points to a *primacy* of some sort. But of what sort? Of "rank and honor," not only, says the Archbishop, but also of "authority." What are his proofs?

"Peter is the first Apostle who performed a miracle." That is a primacy of date, not of authority.

* In the Archbishop's Version, "the rational milk without guile."

“ He is the first to address the Jews in Jerusalem [on the day of Pentecost], while his Apostolic brethren stand respectfully around him.” Where did the Archbishop get that word “respectfully?” It is not in the Record, as he very well knows. Why then does he *foist* it in, and thus give a false *coloring* to the narrative?

“ Peter is the first to make converts from the Gentile world in the persons of Cornelius and his friends.” This also, as well as the preceding, is a primacy not of authority, but of date, in the use of the keys, to open the kingdom of heaven, in the one instance to the Jews, in the other to the Gentiles. Nothing less; nothing more.

“ When it is a question of electing a successor to Judas, Peter *alone speaks*. He points out to the Apostles and disciples the duty of choosing another to succeed the traitor. The Apostles silently acquiesce in the instructions of their leader.” Here is another specimen of false coloring in the words “silently acquiesce.” Peter gives no *instructions*, and therefore they do not *acquiesce* in any. He simply “points out,” as the Archbishop himself correctly expresses it. But there is no exercise of any other authority than that of moderator of the assembly, and that is just what his primacy consists in. As Matthew Henry quaintly expresses it, he is not judge; he is simply foreman of the jury,—spokesman for the other eleven.)

“ In the Apostolic Council of Jerusalem Peter is the first whose sentiments are recorded. Before his discourse, ‘there was much disputing.’ (Acts 15 : 7). But when he had ceased to speak, ‘all the multitude held their peace.’ ” Here we have the Archbishop at his old trick, stopping short in the midst of a sentence, because to have gone on would have shown *why* the multitude held their peace; namely, not because Peter *had spoken*, as the Archbishop tries to make the reader

suppose, but because Barnabas and Paul *were going to speak*, and they wanted to hear them. Evidently they were not satisfied with merely hearing Peter. And with good reason ; for Peter had made no formal proposition. James was the first to do that ; and his proposition, to wit, that “ we write unto them, [viz., the Gentile converts,] that they abstain from pollutions of idols, and from fornication, and from things strangled, and from blood,” “ pleased”—whom? *Pope* Peter? No, but “ the Apostles and elders, with the whole church.” Peter had the same voice in the decision as each of the others ; no less ; no more. But, says the Archbishop, “ St. James and the other Apostles concur in the sentiments of Peter without a single dissenting voice.” Yes, and St. Peter and the other Apostles concur in the proposition of James. And, inasmuch as a proposition is a step in advance of “ sentiments,” if the former fact argues the “ Primacy of Peter” *a fortiori* does the latter fact argue the Primacy of James.

These *five* are all the instances the Archbishop brings forward, of what he calls the “ Exercise of the Primacy.” In the *first three*, Peter was simply the first to do what each of the others afterwards did, namely, work miracles, preach, and baptize. Is Peter, for this reason, Primate? You might as well argue that “ that other disciple” was Primate, because he “ did outrun Peter, and came first to the sepulchre.” In the *fourth* instance, the Primacy exercised by St. Peter is simply that of the moderator of an assembly. And in the *fifth* there is no Primacy at all exercised by him, unless it be a primacy in formal speech-making. And on such evidence we are asked to admit the “ exercise” by St. Peter of primacy of authority over the other Apostles ! When we take leave of logic and common sense, we may do that ; not till then.

The Archbishop now proceeds to a proof that cannot be classed under any of the foregoing heads :

“ St. James is *cast into prison* by Herod, and afterwards beheaded. . . . Yet no extraordinary efforts are made by the faithful to rescue him from death.

“ Peter is imprisoned about the same time. The whole Church is aroused. Prayers for his deliverance ascend to heaven, *not only from Jerusalem, but also from every Christian family in the land.* (Acts 12 : 1-5.) The army of the Lord can afford to lose a chieftain in the person of James ; but it cannot yet spare the commander-in-chief.” (pp. 123, 124.)

The part I have *italicized* in the first of these two paragraphs is not in the record. The Archbishop has added it, because without it his argument would be good for nothing ; leave out the addition, and we have an obvious explanation of any lack of effort in behalf of James, to wit, that his life was taken before it was known to be in danger. In like manner, the part I have *italicized* in the second paragraph is added by the Archbishop, because without it his argument would be weakened. His whole representation in the two paragraphs is a slander on the primitive Christians, as if they would pray earnestly for Peter, and would *not* pray earnestly for James. If the Archbishop should be sent to Coventry for his interpolations of proofs, and mutilations of the Record, his flock will have his own warrant for giving themselves small concern for him, and reserving the bulk of their prayers for the “ Prisoner of the Vatican.”

Having got through with his proofs, the Archbishop proceeds to consider “ the principal objections which are advanced against the Primacy of Peter. They are chiefly, I may say exclusively, confined to the three following : 1. That our Lord rebuked Peter ; 2. that St. Paul criticized his conduct on a point not affecting doctrine, but discipline. . . . 3. That the supremacy of Peter conflicts with the supreme dominion of Christ.” (p. 124.)

If the Archbishop thinks these the "exclusive," or even the "chief," objections, he is wide of the mark. The first and last are not objections at all. The second—Paul's withstanding Peter to the face, (Gal. 2 : 11,)—*is* an objection; because it was *not* "on a point not affecting doctrine," that he withstood him, but on a point affecting doctrine, and because it was an encroachment on Paul's *jurisdiction*, to wit, over the Gentiles. "When James, and Cephas, and John"—mark the order of the names; Peter stands second, not first—"who seemed to be pillars, perceived the grace that was given unto me, they gave to me and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that we should go unto the heathen (the Gentiles), and they unto the circumcision." (Gal. 2 : 9.) This was not a committing of the Gentiles to Paul, but a formal recognition (and in this recognition *James* was foremost, not *Peter*) of the fact that they had been already committed to him by Christ Himself; (Acts 26 : 16, 17;) for, saith the Apostle only two verses before, (Gal. 2 : 7,) "they saw that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed unto me, as the Gospel of the circumcision was unto Peter."—Hence when Peter, after he was come to Antioch, led the way in "dissimulation," thereby drawing after him the other Jews, and even Barnabas, (vv. 12, 13,) Paul "withstood him to the face," because he was thus exercising a moral constraint on the Gentiles, Paul's own charge, "compelling" them "to live as do the Jews," or, as the Archbishop's Version expresses it, "to follow the way of the Jews;" (v. 14;) thereby "frustrating" the "grace of God," (v. 21,) making righteousness to "come by the law," and Christ to have "died in vain." And this, which thus strikes at the very vitals of the Christian faith, is what the Archbishop calls "a point not affecting doctrine, but discipline"!

Equally sure is he that this "withstanding" cannot "invalidate the claims of Peter." "Nay," he says,

“from this very circumstance, I draw a confirming evidence of Peter’s supremacy. St. Paul mentions it as a fact worthy of record, that he actually *withstood Peter to his face*.” (p. 125.) And yet, only a few lines above on the same page, he says, “It is not a very uncommon thing for ecclesiastics occupying an inferior position in the Church to admonish even the Pope.”—That is to say, “St. Paul mentions it as a fact worthy of record, that he *actually*”—did what was “not a very uncommon thing!”

But suppose we let St. Paul himself give the reason of the “mention” as, from the context, we may be sure he would give it if he were now on earth : I withstood Peter because he “dissembled” (v. 13) on a point vital to “the truth of the Gospel ;” (v. 5 ;) and I made mention, to the Galatians, of my withstanding of him, not because he was first in the order of my thoughts, (for he wasn’t ; James was, v. 9,) nor because he was first in authority, (for he had no more authority over me than I had over him ; his was “the apostleship of the circumcision ;” (vv. 7, 8 ;) mine, of the uncircumcision ;) but because it bore directly on that which was the whole burden of my Epistle to the Galatian Christians, to wit, that “if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain.” (v. 21.)

The *order* of the names of the three “pillars” of the Church, in the ninth verse of this chapter, “James, and Cephas, and John,” is a hard nut for the Roman Commentators to crack ; so Professor Ornsby in his note on this verse discreetly passes it over in silence ; but the Rhemish annotator *dishonestly* changes the order, putting Peter first, and James second ; which shows that he felt the significance of the arrangement as it stands in the text of his Version, as well as ours. Suppose the Archbishop should add a Postscript to the next “Thousand” of his work to the following effect : “When I wrote this ‘little volume,’ I was only Bishop

of Richmond. But when Cardinal Giacomini, and Pope Pio Nono, and Cardinal Giovannini, who seemed to be pillars, perceived the inventive ingenuity that was in me in the matter of premises, and the felicitous conclusions that flowed from them, they gave to me the right hand of fellowship that I should be Archbishop of Baltimore, and they remain in charge at Rome." If this Postscript raised an uproar among the faithful, it would be, not because of his promotion, or of its procuring cause, but because the Pope was put second among the three "pillars;" the very place where, if successor to St. Peter, he ought to be, St. Paul, or rather, the Holy Ghost inspiring St. Paul, being judge;—"second-first," if first at all, among the three "pillars" as was Peter at Jerusalem, the jurisdiction having been in James the Bishop of that city.

I have said that the three objections I have been considering are not, as the Archbishop alleges, the only ones. I will give him some others.

I object, then, to the *authoritative* primacy of Peter, that the other Apostles were not aware of it, which they must have been if he had exercised it over them. We have already seen that they saw no primacy of authority over them in the power of the keys, (St. Matt. 16 : 19,) for they came to Jesus some time after, (St. Matt. 18 : 1,) with the question, "Who is the greatest in the kingdom of heaven?" Turning to Acts 8 : 14, I read, further : "Now when the Apostles which were at Jerusalem heard that Samaria had received the word of God, they sent unto them Peter and John." The sender, I take it, is at least not inferior in authority to the sent. If the Archbishop, giving a narrative of the remarkable impulse lately given to the circulation of the Bible in Spain, were to write thus, "Now when the cardinals which were at Rome heard that Hispania had received the Word of God, they sent unto them Pope Pius and Cardinal Giovannini," he would be de-

posed as a heretic for representing the Cardinals as having authority over the Pope.

I object, again, to the *authoritative* primacy of Peter, that he was not himself aware that he possessed it. He begins his First Epistle with, "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ;" and in his second chapter, he discourses eloquently on Christ as the Foundation, and Christians as living stones built thereon, but keeps silent about his being himself a foundation; which he could not, in such a connection, have possibly done, had he been such a foundation as the Archbishop claims. And he begins his fifth chapter with, "The elders (or Presbyters) which are among you, I, your *συμπρεσβύτερος*, co-presbyter,) fellow-elder, *exhort*; not, "I, your 'commander-in-chief,' (p. 124,) *command*." And what is it that he thus *exhorts* them to do? to feed the flock, but not to lord it over them. And he reminds them of the time "when the Chief Shepherd shall appear." But he says nothing (though it would have been specially germane to his subject) of his being himself Chief Shepherd over all the other Shepherds, for the very good reason that he had no such chief shepherdship.

Such are some of the chief objections which the Archbishop has very prudently (or very ignorantly) failed to bring before his readers.—But in disposing or rather trying to dispose of Paul's rebuke of Peter, he has found another proof (!) of Peter's supremacy :

"In the very same Epistle to the Galatians, St. Paul plainly insinuates St. Peter's superior rank. [The *insinuation* is the Archbishop's, as we shall presently see.] 'I went,' he says, (1 : 18,) 'to Jerusalem to see Peter, and I tarried with him fifteen days.' Saints Chrysostom, Jerome, and Ambrose tell us that this was not an idle visit of ceremony, but that the object of St. Paul in making the journey, was to testify his respect and honor for the chief of the Apostles." (pp. 125, 126.)

The Archbishop gives no reference to the particular portions of those fifteen or twenty folio volumes *where* they "tell us" this; but, fortunately, the Rhemish Annotator, to whom the Archbishop is apparently beholden for his information, does give us chapter and verse. His words are :

"Verse 18, *To see Peter*. In what estimation Peter was with this Apostle, it appeareth; seeing for respect and honor of his person, and of duty, as Tertullian, de Præscript., saith: [Tertullian does *not* say that; his words are, "then, as he himself relateth, he *went up to Jerusalem to see Peter*, to wit, because of his office," *i.e.*, of Apostle; *not* because of his "person," "and by right of a common faith and preaching,"] notwithstanding his great affairs Ecclesiastical, he went so far to see him not in vulgar [*i.e.*, common] manner, but as Chrysostom noteth the Greek word to import, to behold him as men behold a thing or person of name, excellency, and majesty, for which cause, and to fill himself with the perfect view of his behavior he abode with him fifteen days. *Hierom.* (Jerome) *Epist.* 103. [Migne l. iii.] *ad Paulinum*, tom. 3. who maketh also a mystery of the number of days that he tarried with Peter. *Ambrose in Comment. hujus loci*, and *Chrysostom* upon this place, and *Hom.* 87 in *Joan.*"

The "Greek word" here referred to is *ἱστορέω*, *historeo*, and it signifies in classic Greek, primarily, *to become acquainted with* a thing or a fact by *inquiry* or by *personal examination*, and, secondarily, *to give an account* *ἱστορία*, *history*, of things or facts thus ascertained. St. Paul is the first to use it to signify *to become acquainted with a person*. But it has nothing whatever to do with the "excellency" or "majesty" of the person or thing with whom or with which acquaintance is sought to be made; you might as well define its derivative, *history*,

as an account of "a thing or person of name, excellency, or majesty!" Hence, did St. Chrysostom say what is imputed to him, he would be letting his rhetoric get the better of his lexicology. But he does not say it. All that is involved in what he says of the word, as also in its derivation, is that acquaintance with the particular person, or thing, is, for some reason or other, important; *not* that the person himself, or the thing itself, is important, or "excellent" or "majestic." That is to say, Paul went up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter, not because of Peter's importance, or "excellency," or "majesty," but because acquaintance with him was important. But why was acquaintance specially with Peter important to Paul? For the reason, doubtless, that Peter was the Apostle specially of the Jews, and Paul the Apostle specially of the Gentiles. This would be a sufficient reason for the visit, especially when taken in connection with the circumstances under which it was made: for it is not true that (as the Rhemish Annotator represents it) "notwithstanding his great affairs ecclesiastical, he went so far to see him," for at this time he had no "great affairs ecclesiastical," not having as yet founded a single Church; for it was but three years from his conversion, and he had spent part of that time in the desert of Arabia, (Gal. 1: 17, 18,) and the rest of it in Damascus; whence having been driven by the hostility of the Jews, whom he had barely escaped by being let down by the wall in a basket by night; (Acts 9: 25; 2 Cor. 11: 33;) and being obliged to go somewhere, and no particular place having any special claim on him, he naturally took the opportunity of this enforced leisure to go up to Jerusalem to make the acquaintance of Peter. Peter's headship of the Jews, therefore, being a sufficient reason for Paul's *leisurely* visit to him, that visit cannot *prove* Peter's headship of the whole Church. It is true St. Chrysostom (Hom. 87, in Johan.) says the

visit was made because Peter "was the mouth and chief of the Apostles ;" but that does not necessarily involve more than Matthew Henry's phrase of "foreman of the jury ;" and if it did, it is only the opinion of Chrysostom, as it is also that of Ambrose, and, as such, is of no more value than the opinion of any man of equal scholarship and judgment at the present day, seeing they both came on the stage three hundred years after Paul and Peter had left it.

St. Ambrose, in his commentary on the passage, says : "It was fit that he should desire to see Peter ; for Peter was first among the Apostles, and to him the Saviour had delegated the care of the Churches." His words are, *Dignum fuit ut cuperet videre Petrum ; quia primus erat inter Apostolos, cui delegaverat Salvator curam Ecclesiarum ;* which shows that he is giving it as *his own* opinion of Peter, and not as *St. Paul's* ; for to make it express St. Paul's opinion, the law of the Latin language would require the words to be, *primus ESSET*, instead of *primus ERAT*.

St. Jerome says nothing whatever to the point for which he is alleged. His "mystery of the number of days that he (Paul) tarried with Peter," to wit, fifteen, runs thus : "For by (or in) this mystery of the number seven and the number eight, the future preacher of the Gentiles was to be instructed." *Hoc enim mysterio hebdomadis et ogdoadis, futurus Gentium prædicator instruendus erat.* If the reader can tell what St. Jerome is here driving at, it is more than I can.—In his Commentary, he speaks plainly enough. St. Paul, he says, stayed with Peter fifteen days, *videndi gratia, non discendi,* "to see him, not to learn from him." And the same says St. Ambrose : *non utique ut aliquid ab eo disceret ; . . . sed propter affectum apostolatus, et ut sciret Petrus hanc illi datam licentiam quam et ipse acceperat ;* that is : "not that he might learn something from him ; . . . but out of affection for the Apostolic [not

the *Archiapostolic*] office, and that Peter might know that *the same freedom had been given to him, (Paul,) that he (Peter) himself had received.*" And he adds, a little below, that Paul abode with Peter fifteen days, *quasi unanimes coapostolus*, "as a like-minded co-apostle."

So much for the Archbishop's last proof from Scripture, and for his appeal to "Chrysostom, Jerome, and Ambrose." I will only add that if such a passage as this of 2 Cor. 11 : 28, "Beside those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the churches," had been St. Peter's instead of St. Paul's, it would have been a hard nut for us to crack, and we should never have heard the last of it : and most certainly the Rhemish Version would have translated it into plain English, instead of "darkening counsel by words without knowledge," (Job 38 : 2,) after this fashion : "Besides those things which are outwardly : my daily instance, the carefulness of all Churches" !

I have now examined every one of the Archbishop's *proofs* of Peter's Primacy, and shown that most of them prove no primacy at all, and not one of them a primacy of *authority*—a commandership-in-chief. But suppose it had been otherwise. Suppose he had made out his case, and proved Peter's primacy, in his sense of the word ; still it is nothing to his purpose, unless he can prove that that primacy passed to the Bishops of Rome as the Successors of Peter. To that proof, therefore, he now addresses himself ; and as he is aware that his whole case depends upon it, he lays himself out accordingly, and *actually* devotes no less than *one whole page and seven lines of another page* of his "little volume" to the proof of this little claim. And *such* proof !

That the reader may not think I am misrepresenting the Archbishop, I here transcribe the *whole* proof, paragraph for paragraph, word for word, letter for letter, point for point ; and trust the argument will not lose any of its force in the transcription :

1. " St. Peter is called the first Bishop of Rome, because he transferred his See from Antioch to Rome, where he suffered martyrdom with St. Paul.

2. " We are not surprised that modern skepticism, which rejects the divinity of Christ, and denies even the existence of God, should call in question the fact that St. Peter lived and died in Rome.

3. " The reason commonly alleged for disputing this well-attested event, is that the Acts of the Apostles make no mention of Peter's labors and martyrdom in Rome. For the same reason, we might deny that St. Paul was beheaded in Rome, that St. John died in Ephesus, and that St. Andrew was crucified. The Scripture is silent regarding these historical records, and yet they are denied by no one.

4. " The intrinsic evidence of St. Peter's first Epistle, the testimony of his immediate successors in the ministry, as well as the avowal of eminent Protestant commentators, all concur in fixing the See of Peter in Rome.

5. " ' Babylon,' from which Peter addresses his first Epistle, is understood by learned annotators, Protestant and Catholic, to refer to Rome,—the word Babylon being symbolical of the corruption then prevailing in the city of the Cæsars.

6. " Clement, the fourth Bishop of Rome, who is mentioned in terms of praise by St. Paul ; St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch, who died in 105 ; Irenæus, Origen, St. Jerome, Eusebius the great historian, and other eminent writers, testify to St. Peter's residence in Rome ; while no ancient ecclesiastical writer has ever contradicted the statement.

7. " John Calvin, a witness above suspicion, Cave, an able Anglican critic, Grotius, and other distinguished writers, do not hesitate to re-echo the unanimous voice of Catholic tradition.

8. " Indeed, no historical fact will escape the shafts of incredulity if St. Peter's residence and glorious

martyrdom in Rome are called in question." (pp. 126, 127.)

Here is the *whole* of the Archbishop's *proof* that the primacy of Peter passed to the Bishops of Rome as his successors ; and with this he closes the chapter. In the opening of his next chapter he argues that the primacy must have passed to Peter's successors, but does not undertake to prove who those successors were ; but more of this when we come to it. His whole proof that the primacy descended to the Bishops of Rome is contained in the eight paragraphs above quoted, and which I have numbered, for convenience of reference.

The *first* paragraph is not a proof, but a proposition, to be proved.

The *second* is simply an expression of non-surprise.

The *third* gives a "commonly-alleged" objection from the silence of the Acts of the Apostles in regard to Peter's labors and martyrdom in Rome. This is *not* "a commonly-alleged" objection ; nor have I ever seen it alleged by any one. What is alleged, is the silence of St. Paul's Epistles to and from Rome ; of which I will presently speak.

The *fourth* is, like the *first*, a proposition to be proved.

The *fifth* is also a proposition, but I will not require proof of it ; I will admit that "Babylon" (1 St. Peter 5: 13) "is understood by learned annotators, Protestant and " Roman, to refer to Rome. *Per contra*, it is also "understood by learned annotators," Roman as well as Protestant, *not* to refer to Rome. What says the Roman Annotator Erasmus, a contemporary of the Reformers, and one of the most learned men of the age? *Sunt qui Babylonem hic interpretent Romam ; quod mihi sane non usquequaque probatur. Magis arbitror Petrum id temporis verté Babylone vixisse ;* that is, "Some by Babylon understand Rome ; but to me indeed that

lacks proof. Rather, I believe that Peter was at that time living in the real Babylon." He adds that Papias took Babylon to mean Rome, but in disparagement of his opinion refers to Eusebius, who says of Papias (l. iii. c. 39) that he was "very limited in his comprehension," and reports "matters rather too fabulous." Erasmus says also that Jerome, in one of his Epistles, follows Papias, but that in doing it he is indulging his bile because he had been slightly received in Rome—*sed stomacho suo servientem, quod illic indignis modis esset acceptus*. (Erasm. in *Crit. Sacr.*)

And what says Dupin? "Q. Whence was it (1 St. Peter) writ? A. It is dated at Babylon. Many of the Antients have understood that Name to signifie Rome; but no Reason appears, that could prevail with St. Peter to change the Name of Rome into that of Babylon. How could those to whom he wrote understand that Babylon was Rome? There were many Jews at Babylon, and St. Peter, who was the Apostle of the Jews, went so far to preach the Gospel of Jesus Christ to the Jews." (*Hist. of the Church, New Test., chap. v.*)

Dupin may well ask, "How could those to whom he wrote understand that Babylon was Rome?" How, indeed? There is not a particle of proof, or even of probability, that Rome was ever called Babylon till St. John called it by that name in his Revelation, thirty years after the death of St. Peter. Besides, as Capellus (in *Crit. Sacr.*) well says, *exemplum in subscriptione hujusmodi nullum*, "there is no instance of this sort in a subscription." What would be thought of Archbishop McCloskey if, writing to the New England portion of his Provincial flock, he should wind up with, "The Church which is in *Gotham*, elected together, saluteth you"? Suppose we let the superscription interpret the subscription: "Peter, an Apostle of Jesus Christ, to the strangers scattered throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia." Babylon

is to the east, or rather south-east, of these countries ; Rome is to the west of them. Pontus, Galatia, and Cappadocia are to the east of Asia and Bithynia. Peter writing from Babylon names them in the natural order : Peter writing from Rome would be naming them in an order the reverse of natural ; as if the Archbishop of Baltimore, writing to the faithful of that part of his province outside the archdiocese, should begin thus : " James, Archbishop of Baltimore, to the faithful scattered through East Florida, Georgia, South and North Carolina, Virginia, Delaware, and Pennsylvania." Every one can see that if he were writing from St. Augustine, he being there resident, this would be the natural order ; but, if writing from Baltimore, it would be the reverse of the natural order ; just as to St. Peter, if writing from Rome, the order in which he names the countries is the reverse of the natural order. So much for the fifth paragraph.

In the *sixth* paragraph, the Archbishop lays down another proposition requiring proof, but of which he vouchsafes none ; to wit, that six " eminent writers," whose names he mentions, " testify to St. Peter's residence in Rome." Now the first two of these six—namely, " Clement, the fourth Bishop of Rome," and " St. Ignatius, Bishop of Antioch," were both contemporaries of St. Peter, and one of them was Bishop of the city from which, and the other of the city to which, St. Peter *is said* to have " transferred his see ;" they are therefore competent witnesses, and the very best that we could desire. If they testify as the Archbishop says they do, then I give up my case. Do they so testify ?

The only *genuine* writings of Clement extant are his two Epistles to the Corinthians, and even of these the second is held by some to be spurious ; whether rightly or otherwise matters not, as all that it contains respecting Peter is the following : " The Lord saith, ' ye shall

be as sheep in the midst of wolves.' Peter answered and said, 'what if the wolves shall tear in pieces the sheep?' Jesus said unto Peter, 'let not the sheep fear the wolves after death' (Mat. 10 : 16 [28])" (chap. 5). And here is what is said of Peter in the *first* Epistle : "Peter, by unjust envy, underwent not one or two, but many sufferings ; until at last being martyred, he went to the place of glory that was due unto him" (chap. 5). "Verily he [Paul] did by the Spirit admonish you concerning himself, and Cephas, and Apollos" (chap. 47). This is absolutely all there is in Clement about Peter. It is manifest, then, that there is no foundation for what the Archbishop says about Clement's testimony.

How is it with Ignatius? Of his seven *genuine* Epistles (and there are only seven), there is but one—the Epistle to the Romans—in which mention is made of Peter ; and here is what is said of him : "I do not, as Peter and Paul, command you. They were apostles, I a condemned man ; they were free, but I am even to this day a servant : but if I shall suffer, I shall then become the freeman of Jesus Christ, and shall rise free" (chap. 4). This is all ; absolutely all. There is no foundation then for what the Archbishop says of Ignatius's testimony any more than for what he said of Clement's.

But perhaps the Archbishop has in mind the *Clementine Recognitions*, and the larger Epistles ascribed to Ignatius? If so, either he knows (what is the fact) that they are *spurious*—in which case he exhibits a shameless effrontery, or he does not know it—in which case he shows a discreditable ignorance of what he is writing about ; discreditable in an Archbishop and Metropolitan ; particularly discreditable in a volunteer controversialist. He may take his choice between the two horns of the dilemma ; either of them will gore him badly.

Irenæus is the Archbishop's next witness, and as he

was born in the first half of the second century and probably within sixty (some say fifty) years after the death of St. Peter, and was at one time in Rome on a mission or embassy from the martyrs of Lyons, then in prison, of which city he was afterwards Bishop, and had moreover in early life been a pupil of Polycarp the disciple of St. John, and used often to hear from him his reminiscences of that Apostle, his testimony is entitled to respectful consideration. What, then, is that testimony? The Archbishop, as in so many other instances, gives no references. Fortunately, however, as on a previous occasion, the Rhemish annotator, whom the Archbishop seems to be retailing, gives chapter and verse, to wit, *lib. 3, c. 3*, in the second section of which I find, in the old Latin translation (for the Greek original of this section is lost) Irenæus saying that as it would take too long to give the succession of the Bishops of all the Churches, he will give that of "the greatest, and most ancient, and to all well known Church founded and constituted at Rome by the two most glorious Apostles, Peter and Paul"—*a gloriosissimis duobus Apostolis Petro et Paulo Romæ fundatæ et constitutæ Ecclesiæ*. And in the next section, which is in the original Greek, I read: "The blessed Apostles therefore (viz., Peter and Paul, as mentioned in the preceding section) having founded and built the Church, handed over (*ἐνεχείρισαν*) the ministry of the Episcopate to Linus, the same whom Paul makes mention of in the Epistles to Timothy: to him succeeded Anencletus. After him, and in the third place from the Apostles, Clement, etc."

We have it then from Irenæus, a witness called into court by the Archbishop himself, that the Church at Rome was founded by Peter and Paul. Now St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans was written within ten years of his death, and up to that time (Rom. 15 : 22-24) he had never been at Rome. There was, therefore, at that

time no organized Church of Rome, but only small worshipping assemblies meeting (Rom. 16 : 5) in private houses ; and accordingly the Epistle is addressed (Rom. 1 : 7) *not* (after the analogy of the two to the Corinthians) to " the Church of God which is at Rome," but, " to all that be in Rome, beloved of God, called to be saints ;" which sufficiently disposes of that fable of St. Peter's twenty-five years' residence in Rome as its Bishop. Not only that, but two years later, when St. Paul, having been brought a prisoner to Rome, " called the chief of the Jews together" (Acts 28 : 17), so little were they aware of the existence of a church among them of which, as is alleged, Peter had then been Bishop even according to the Chronological Table of the Rhemish annotator *fourteen years*, but according to ours *seventeen*, that they actually said to St. Paul (Acts 28 : 22), " We desire to hear of thee what thou thinkest: for as concerning this sect, we know that everywhere it is spoken against." And *so* desirous were they that they actually " appointed him a day," and " there came many to him into his lodging ;" and the result of his " expounding," and " testifying," and " persuading" (ver. 23), " from morning till evening," was (ver. 24) that " some believed the things which were spoken, and some believed not." Evidently this was the first time they had had the opportunity of hearing these things from an Apostle. And yet we are bid believe that Peter, the special Apostle of the Jews, had been Bishop among them at least fourteen years, and all the while had never once found, or made, an opportunity of " expounding," and " testifying" to, and " persuading," them, although " some of them" were so ready to be persuaded, that at the very first preaching of these things to them they believed. *Credat Romanus, non ego.* I will not so slander " the Prince of the Apostles ;" nor will I so magnify his fellow-apostle at his expense. I leave that to those who claim to be

exclusively his flock, and of whom, if he were now on earth, he might well say, save me from my "friends." In the words of Tertullian (*De Prescriptione*, 24), "I am not good man enough, or rather I am not bad man enough, to set the apostles the one against the other."

The Archbishop's next witness is Origen, who was born within one hundred and sixteen years after the death of St. Peter. His testimony, as reported by Eusebius (l. iii. c. 1), which is what the Rhemish annotator (from whom the Archbishop probably borrowed it) refers to, is this: "Peter appears to have preached through Pontus, Galatia, Bithynia, Cappadocia, and Asia, to the Jews that were scattered abroad; who also, finally coming to Rome, was crucified with his head downward, having requested of himself to suffer in this way." There is not a word here of his preaching at Rome. The great scene of his preaching was evidently, in the opinion of Origen (the Archbishop's own witness), the countries named. Nor is there a syllable of his being Bishop of Rome; still less of his being Bishop there for a quarter of a century; for no ingenuity can make "*finally* coming to Rome, was crucified," mean, coming twenty-five years, or even fifteen years, *before* he was crucified.

This twenty-five years' episcopate rests on the mere assertion of the Archbishop's last two witnesses, Eusebius and Jerome, the former of whom was not born till more than two hundred years, and the latter more than two hundred and fifty years after the death of St. Peter; and as neither of them gives any authority for his assertion, and that assertion is in flat contradiction with that of Irenæus and Origen, their testimony is good for nothing.

So much for the Archbishop's *sixth* paragraph. His *seventh* and *eighth* call for no remark.

To recur now to his *first* paragraph, which contains the proposition, but not the proof, that St. Peter trans-

ferred his see from Antioch to Rome. To this proposition I reply that he could not transfer his see, for the simple reason that he had no see. He was not a See Bishop ; nor was any other of the twelve. They were travelling missionaries, "ordained" (St. Mark 3 : 14) and "sent forth" (St. Mat. 10 : 5) as such, by the Lord Himself ; and His "marching orders" to them—to the "commander-in-chief," as well as to the other commanders—were, "Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature" (St. Mark 16 : 15) ; and His last words to them on earth (Acts 1 : 8) were, "Ye shall be witnesses unto me both in Jerusalem, and in all Judæa, and in Samaria, and unto the uttermost part of the earth." And says St. Mark (who, we are told, wrote under the direction of St. Peter) in the last verse of his Gospel, "They went forth, and preached everywhere." There is not the slightest *evidence* that any one of them settled down as the Head of a Diocesan Church. James, the Lord's brother, was, indeed, the Head of the Church of Jerusalem. But he was not one of the twelve, for, at the time they were appointed, he was not even a believer ; for their appointment (St. Mat. 10) was before the "Feeding of the Five Thousand" (St. Mat. 14 : 15-21 ; St. John 6 : 4-14) and it is after that, to wit, in St. John 7 : 5, that we are told, "For neither did his brethren believe in him." And when they afterwards became believers, we find them (Acts 1 : 13, 14) distinguished from the eleven. And accordingly we find that while St. Peter begins both of his Epistles with the assertion of his Apostleship, and St. Paul nine of his in the same way, St. James begins his, "James, a servant of God and of the Lord Jesus Christ," and St. Jude his, "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ, and brother of James." As to Gal. 1 : 19, "Other of the apostles saw I none, save (*εἰ μὴ*, *unless*) James the Lord's brother," if James is here called an apostle (which is doubtful), it no more makes him one

of the twelve than calling Paul and Barnabas apostles makes them of the twelve. See a condensed statement of the argument on both sides by Dr. Schaff, in Lange on St. Matthew, Am. Ed., pp. 256-260.

In conclusion, if we may believe Irenæus and Tertullian—both of whom were a hundred years nearer the Apostles than Eusebius, and a hundred and fifty nearer than Jerome, and therefore by so much the more likely to know the truth—if, I say, we may believe Irenæus and Tertullian, the former of whom, as we have seen, says that Peter and Paul handed over the episcopate to Linus, to whom succeeded Anencletus, and after him Clement; and the latter of whom says (*De Prescript.* 32) “the Church of Smyrna recounteth that Polycarp was placed there by St. John; as that of Rome doth that Clement was in like manner ordained by Peter;” it follows that there were three Popes of Rome, one after another, in the lifetime of St Peter. Hence it is plain that if St. Peter ever was Pope, he had ceased to be, long before his death, for two contemporary lawful Popes is a thing unheard of even in Rome herself.

CHAPTER X.

THE SUPREMACY OF THE POPE.

AWARE that in the eight paragraphs I have been remarking on, and which I have quoted in full on pages 133-134, he has not even asserted any supremacy of Peter over the whole Church, or even, except in paragraphs one and four, over the Church of Rome, and that he has not so much as attempted to *prove* even that, as the reader can see for himself by turning back to those paragraphs and reading them again, the Archbishop opens this Tenth Chapter with what he expects

(or seems to expect) to pass for *proof* that Peter's Primacy passed (being metamorphosed into Supremacy in the passage) from him to the Bishops of Rome, as his successors: "The Church is in all ages as much in need of a Supreme Ruler as it was in the days of the Apostles. Nay more." I answer, she has a Supreme Ruler now, as she had then; and that Supreme Ruler is not and was not Peter. "There is another King, one Jesus" (Acts 17:7); the same whom Peter himself (1 Pet. 5:4) calls "the Chief Shepherd," or, as it is in the Latinized English of the Archbishop's Version and of the Rhemish, "the Prince of Pastors." It needs no other; and accordingly it never has had, and, we may rest assured, never will have, any. As I have already twice remarked, it has no more "need of a central power to preserve its unity" (p. 128) than Free Masonry has. But granting, for argument's sake, the "need," and that the need infers the supply, in the shape of Successors of Peter, how does that prove that the Bishops of Rome are those successors? Yet that is the inference which the Archbishop draws; for he goes on, in the next paragraph:

"Whatsoever privileges, *therefore*, were conferred on Peter, which may be considered essential to the government of the Church, are inherited by the Bishops of Rome, as successors of the Prince of the Apostles; just as the constitutional powers given to George Washington have devolved on the present incumbent of the Presidential chair."

Here is a gap in the logic, as well as a flaw in the illustration. Perhaps the Archbishop doesn't see either the gap or the flaw.

The *flaw* is in this, that whereas certain "privileges" were "conferred on Peter," without mention of successors, the "constitutional powers" were "given," not "to George Washington," but, to the "President of the United States," which George Washington was

not, at that time. "The executive power shall be vested in a President of the United States of America," says the Constitution; not, "in George Washington and his successors;" still less, "in George Washington." On the contrary, he was "elected" to the office, as were all his successors down to "the (then—that is, at the time the Archbishop wrote) present incumbent," Ulysses S. Grant, with the exception of Tyler, Fillmore, and Johnson, on whom, respectively, and on whom alone, in the language of the Constitution, "the powers and duties of the said office" did "devolve." The Archbishop is peculiarly infelicitous in drawing analogies from the civil institutions of his country, as we shall see again in the next chapter. So much for the pretended illustration. To make it a real one, it should read, "just as the constitutional powers first exercised by George Washington have devolved on Marshall McMahon;" and then the *gap* in the logic would be patent; for it would at once occur to the reader that "just as" McMahon's successorship to Washington needs proof, so does the successorship of the Bishops of Rome to St. Peter. And yet no proof is forthcoming. It is *asserted*, indeed, in the *first* of the eight paragraphs that Peter's see was finally fixed at Rome; and it is *asserted* in the *fourth* that this fixation can be proved by "the intrinsic evidence of St. Peter's first Epistle," by "the testimony of his immediate successors in the ministry," and by "the avowal of eminent Protestant commentators;" but none of these "avowals" of this "testimony," of this "evidence," is laid before us by the Archbishop. "St. Peter's first Epistle" is in the hands of his non-Roman readers, and may be safely left there. Grotius and Clarius concur in making "Babylon" Rome, but neither they nor any other of the fifteen or twenty "eminent Protestant commentators" at hand as I write, "fix the See of Peter in Rome." As to the other witnesses, I suppose that not

more than the first *ten* Bishops of Rome, the last of whom died exactly a hundred years after the death of St. Peter, could, by the utmost stretch of language, be called "his *immediate* successors." Of these, St. Clement testifies to his martyrdom, as I have already shown, but does not tell us where it took place, or that he was ever in Rome, to say nothing of having his See there. The other nine have left no writings behind them. Says Dupin (*Hist. of the Church, Three First Centuries*, chap. vi.), "The first Letter of St. Clement to the Corinthians, which St. Irenæus mentions, is one of the most beautiful and standing Monuments of that Antiquity. The second is not so evidently St. Clement's; and the Works ascribed to him are not his. The other Epistles that bear his Name are forged, as well as all the Epistles of the first Popes down to Siricius [the 37th Bishop of Rome, A.D. 384-398], which [namely, the forgery] is the Work of Isidorus Mercator, who lived in the eighth Century." Really, it is rather late in the day thus to attempt to foist upon us the Forged Decretals, which did such yeoman's service to the Papacy in the Dark Ages, but which have been long since exploded!

"From what I have said, you can easily infer that the arguments in favor of Peter's Primacy have equal weight in demonstrating the supremacy of the Popes" (p. 129).

How the arguments in favor of one man's *primacy* can demonstrate another man's *supremacy* is a problem for archiepiscopal logic; common logic is not equal to it. And so the Archbishop himself seems to think; for in the next paragraph he says he will "endeavor to show, from incontestable historical evidence, that the Popes have always, from the days of the Apostles, continued to exercise supreme jurisdiction [mark that], not only in the Western church, till the Reformation, but also

throughout the Eastern church, till the great schism of the ninth century.

. "1. Take the question of appeals. An appeal is never made from a superior to an inferior court, nor even from one court to another of co-ordinate jurisdiction. We do not appeal from Washington to Richmond, but from Richmond to Washington. Now, if we find the See of Rome, from the foundation of Christianity [though it didn't *exist* till seven years after Peter went to Antioch], entertaining and deciding cases of appeal from the Oriental churches; if we find that her decision was final and irrevocable, we must conclude that the supremacy of Rome over all the churches is an undeniable fact" (pp. 129, 130).

That doesn't follow, even if the premises are true (which they are not, as we shall presently see), for the African churches were not "Oriental," and they expressly forbade appeals to Rome. (Concil. Milevitani ii. (anno 416) can. 22. See the original Latin in *Gieseler*, vol. 1, § 94, n. 62.)

"To begin with Pope St. Clement. . . . Some dissension and scandal having occurred in the church of Corinth, the matter is brought to the notice of Pope Clement. He at once exercises his supreme authority by writing letters of remonstrance and admonition to the Corinthians" (p. 130).

Where is the "appeal" here, and where the authoritative judgment on appeal? Where is the decision of the "inferior court"? Where that of the "superior"? Here is neither "Richmond" nor "Washington." Bringing a thing to the notice even of a tribunal, is not an "appeal" to it; neither is "writing letters of remonstrance and admonition" "entertaining and deciding" an appeal. At any rate, they don't do things so in "Washington;" and if they did, there would be no "authority," "supreme" or non-supreme, in their action. Any man can "remonstrate" with any other

man ; and, in like manner, any church can remonstrate with any other church : and as to admonition, we are told on high authority, even that of the Archbishop himself (p. 125), that “ it is not a very uncommon thing for ecclesiastics occupying an inferior position in the Church to admonish even the Pope ;” and that “ St. Bernard” did that very thing “ to Pope Eugenius III.,” and did it “ with Apostolic freedom ;” which is as much, to say the least, as St. Clement did ; for in his Epistles, unlike those of St. Paul to the same Church, there is no *tone* of authority, no “ coming with a rod ” (1 Cor. 4 : 21), no question, “ *Dare* any of you . . . go to law” (1 Cor. 6 : 1), no warning, “ If I come again, I will not spare.” (2 Cor. 13 : 2). His second Epistle (if it be his) is a brief hortatory discourse ; nothing less ; nothing more. In his first Epistle, he is simply the mouthpiece of his own church to a sister church. The Epistle begins thus :

“ The Church of God which sojourneth at Rome to the Church of God which sojourneth at Corinth, elect, sanctified, by the will of God, through Jesus Christ our Lord : grace and peace from the Almighty God, by Jesus Christ, be multiplied unto you.

“ BRETHREN,

“ The sudden and unexpected dangers and calamities that have fallen upon us, have, we fear, made us the more slow in our consideration of those things which you inquired of us : as also of that wicked and detestable sedition, so unbecoming the elect of God, which a few heady and self-willed men have fomented to such a degree of madness, that your venerable and renowned name, so worthy of all men to be beloved, is greatly blasphemed thereby.”

Throughout the whole Epistle, there is not one solitary *command* as distinguished from an *exhortation*. It

is simply such an Epistle as any church might write to a sister church, on a footing of the most perfect equality. I distinctly challenge the Archbishop to point out a single instance of an assertion, or implication, of *jurisdictional* authority, in it.

The next "appeal" is "to Pope St. Victor I.," "about the year 190," in regard to "the proper day for celebrating Easter." "St. Victor directs the Eastern churches, for the sake of uniformity, to conform to the practice of the West, and *his instructions are universally followed*" (p. 130).

The Archbishop is right about Victor's "directing" them ; but it was a piece of impudence on his part, and met with the reception from the East which it so richly deserved ; while, in the West, even Irenæus, who agreed with him as to the proper day, "severely censured Victor by letter," says Socrates (*Eccl. Hist.*; l. v. c. 22), "for his immoderate heat." (It is marvellous that an Archbishop, with Eusebius at hand, and the Synodal Epistle of Nice within reach, should venture on the assertion I have *italicized*. What said Polycrates, Bishop of Ephesus, as reported by Eusebius (l. v. c. 24)? "For there were seven, my relatives, Bishops, and I am the eighth ; and my relatives always observed the day when the people (*i.e.*, the Jews) threw away the leaven. I, therefore, brethren, am now sixty-five years in the Lord, who having conferred with the brethren throughout the world, and having studied the whole of the Sacred Scriptures, am not at all alarmed at those things with which I am threatened, to intimidate me. For they who are greater than I, have said, 'we ought to obey God rather than men.' " No wonder that such a man, when Victor excommunicated him, and those who held with him, including "the churches of all Asia, together with the neighboring churches," A.D., 196, set at naught the *brutum fulmen*, and that the Eastern custom went on with them a hundred and twenty-

nine years longer, down to the first General Council, at Nice, when, for the first time a friendly agreement was reached, as witness the following, from the Synodal Epistle of that Council: "We however declare to you the glad tidings of our agreement respecting our most holy feast of Easter; that by your prayers, this particular also has been rightly settled, so that all the brethren of the East, who formerly kept the feast with the Jews, and did not agree with the Romans, and with you, and with all those who have from the beginning kept it with us, shall from henceforth keep it with us." So much for Pope St. Victor, who was any thing but victorious in the matter of his claim to "entertain and decide" cases on "appeal." The Church of his day recognized no such claim.

"Dionysius, Bishop of Rome, about the middle of the third century, having heard that the Patriarch of Alexandria erred on some points of faith, demands an explanation of the suspected Prelate, who, in obedience to his superior, promptly vindicates his own orthodoxy" (p. 131).

Change "demands" into "requests," and "in obedience to his superior" into "in compliance with the request of his brother Bishop," and leave out the word "promptly," since the vindication was a treatise which he composed, in four books, and the Archbishop's paragraph will express, what, as it stands, it does not express, namely, the truth. In this, the Bishop of Rome did no more than any other Bishop might do. At this very time, Paul of Samosata, Bishop of Antioch, was called to account for heresy, first by Firmilian of Cappadocia, and afterwards by his brother Bishops in Council, tried, condemned, deposed, and Domnus put in his place, without so much as the Pope's knowing it till all was over, and then notice sent to him (and at the same time to the Patriarch of Alexandria) not that he might hear the case on appeal—such a thing was un-

known to the Church of that age—but that he might (to use the very words of the notice) “write [to Domnus], and receive letters of communion from him;”—the very same purpose for which the notice was sent also to the Patriarch of Alexandria. There was not the slightest distinction made by the Council, in this matter, between the Pope and the Patriarch. See the history of it at large, in *Eusebius* (l. vii. cc. 27–30).

I have thus disposed of three of the Archbishop's instances. I might go on, and dispose of the other five; but there is no need of it. *Falsus in tribus, falsus in omnibus.*

I will only add in regard to Julius I., the Archbishop's fourth instance, that his power in the matter of appeals, whatever it was, was derived from the express grant of the Council of Sardica (A.D. 347),* a grant made at the instance of Hosius, Bishop of Cordova, one of the Presidents of the Council of Nice, twenty-two years before, which Council, so far from being aware of any power in the Bishop of Rome to “entertain and decide” appeals, actually enacted in its fifth canon that appeals should be decided finally by Provincial Synods, to be “assembled twice every year in every Province.” And yet we are assured by the Archbishop that the right of “entertaining and deciding” appeals, which the three hundred and eighteen Bishops of the Council of Nice had never heard of, and which the Council of Sardica, twenty-two years later, conferred for the first time on Pope Julius I., had belonged to the “See of Rome, from the foundation of Christianity”!

“2. Christians of every denomination admit the orthodoxy of the Fathers of the first five centuries of the Church [What! Of Tertullian and Origen?] . . .

* See *Gieseler*, Period II. § 94. Bower's History of the Popes, vol. I., Julius.

“ Now the Fathers of the Church, with one voice, pay homage to the Bishops of Rome as their superiors” (p. 132).

As the Archbishop on account of his “ limited space” gives no extracts on this *vital* point, but contents himself with referring his readers to “ a work ” (in at least three volumes, for he quotes (p. 210) from the third), “ entitled, ‘ Faith of Catholics,’ ” and as not one in a thousand of them probably ever saw it, or ever will see it, I shall content myself with showing the falsity of the Archbishop’s assertion that they, “ *with one voice*, pay homage,” etc.

St. Polycarp, pupil of St. John and Bishop of Smyrna, is one of “ the Fathers of the Church,” his Epistle to the Philippians being contained in the various editions of the Apostolic Fathers. Did he pay homage to the Bishop of Rome *as his superior*? What says Eusebius (l. v. c. 24), quoting from Irenæus, in the matter of the proper time for keeping Easter?

“ And when the blessed Polycarp went to Rome, in the time of Anicetus (A.D. 157-168), and they had a little difference among themselves likewise respecting other matters, they immediately were reconciled, not disputing much with one another on this head. For neither could Anicetus persuade Polycarp not to observe it [namely, the day of the Jewish Passover, as Easter], because he had always observed it with John the disciple of our Lord, and the rest of the apostles, with whom he associated; and neither did Polycarp persuade Anicetus to observe, who said that he was bound to maintain the practice of the presbyters before him. Which things being so, they communed with each other; and in the church Anicetus yielded to Polycarp, out of respect, no doubt, the office of consecrating [the bread and wine], and they separated from each other in peace, all the church being at peace; both

those that observed and those that did not observe, maintaining peace."

Plainly, St. Polycarp paid no homage to Anicetus as his superior. The two Bishops met on a footing of perfect equality ; of mutual respect and regard ; and so they parted. If all the Bishops of Rome had been like Anicetus, the Church would have remained united and harmonious even until now.

What says St. Cyprian (one of the Fathers specially mentioned by the Archbishop) with his fellow Bishops of the Council of Carthage (A.D. 256) in opposition to the claim of Pope Stephen ?

"None of us styles himself Bishop of Bishops, or forces his colleagues to obedience by the dread of his tyranny : since every Bishop is free to act as he will, according to the liberty and power which belong to him ; nor can he be judged by another, in such sort as he cannot become the other's judge (*tamque judicari ab alio non possit, quam nec ipse potest judicare*). But we await, one and all, the judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has the power both of preferring us in the government of His Church and of judging of our conduct." (*In Concil. Carthag.*) See the original Latin in *Browne on the Articles*, Art. 37 ; also in *Gieseler*, vol. i., sect. 68, where may be found, condensed into six octavo pages, the very pith and marrow of the hierarchical arrangements, with numerous citations of authorities in Greek and Latin.

What says St. Jerome (another of the Fathers specially mentioned by the Archbishop) in his Epistle to Evangelus ?

"The Church of Rome is not to be thought one thing, and that of the whole world another. Gaul, and Britain, and Africa, and Persia, and the East, and Judæa, and all the barbarous nations, adore also one Christ, and observe the same rule of truth. If authority is sought for, the world is greater than one city.

Wherever there is a Bishop, whether at Rome or Eugubium, or Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, or Tanis, he is of the same excellency, of the same Episcopate. The power of wealth and the lowliness of poverty do not make a Bishop either less or greater ; but they are all the successors of the Apostles." Migne, *Patrologia*, vol. xxii. (Hieronim. vol. i.), col. 1194.

So much for Cyprian and Jerome. If either or both of them elsewhere speak a different language, so much the worse for the Archbishop ; for they are *his* witnesses ; he called them into court, along with others, to prove that they, "*with one voice*, pay homage to the Bishops of Rome as their superiors," and they prove just the contrary ; as does also St. Polycarp, whom he *didn't* call into court, because he knew that his testimony, the testimony of his actions—and actions speak louder than words—would make an irreparable *break* in the "*one voice*."

I might go on to examine the other witnesses specially mentioned by the Archbishop, Basil, Chrysostom, Augustine, Ambrose, and Leo. But there is no need ; for even if they all spoke "*with one voice*" on his side of the question, which they do not, the "*one voice*" has been already shattered into hopeless fragments.

"3. Ecumenical Councils afford another eloquent vindication of Papal supremacy. . . .

"The first General Council was held in Nicæa (Nice) in 325 ; the second, in Constantinople, in 381 ; the third in Ephesus, in 431 ; the fourth, in Chalcedon, in 451 ; the fifth, in Constantinople, in 553 ; the sixth, in the same city, in 680 ; the seventh, in Nicæa, in 787 ; and the eighth, in Constantinople, 869.

"The Bishops of Rome convoked these assemblages, *or at least consented to their convocation* ; they presided by their legates over all of them, except the first and second councils of Constantinople, and they confirmed all these eight by their authority" (pp. 133, 134).

The clause I have *italicized* is well put in, for so far as respects the first four—and I shall not concern myself about the last four (only two of which, by the way, are General), since the earliest of them was in the latter half of the sixth century, by which time the influence of the Bishop of Rome had very much increased—I say, so far as respects the first four, not one of them was convoked by the Bishop of Rome; nor did he preside by his legates over any of them; nor was his consent given (except in the case of the fourth, of which more presently) before, and in order to, the convoking of them. What says Dupin?

“Q. Which is the first Œcumenical or General Council?

“A. That which was held at Niece in Bithynia, in the year 325.

“Q. Who called that Council?

“A. The Emperor Constantine. . . . The Legates of Pope St. Sylvester assisted [that is, were present] at it. We don't certainly know who was President of that Assembly, but 'tis likely it was Osius Bishop of Corduba.” (Dupin, Century iv., chap. 4.)

According to others, the Council had three Presidents, Alexander, Bishop of Alexandria, Eustathius of Antioch, and Hosius of Cordova. Hosius, however, was not, as is pretended, one of the legates of the Bishop of Rome; for Eusebius, in his *Life of Constantine* (l. iii. c. 7), as reported by Socrates (*Eccl. Hist.* l. i. c. 8), expressly distinguishes him from them thus: “Hosius, the most celebrated of the Spaniards, took his seat among the rest. The prelate of the imperial city [Rome] was absent through age; but his presbyters were present, and filled his place.” What that “place” was, which they “filled,” we may learn from Theodoret (*Eccl. Hist.* l. i. c. 7): The bishop of Rome, on account of his very advanced age, was necessarily absent, but he sent two presbyters to the council, for

the purpose [of presiding in his stead? no] of taking part in all the transactions."

"When Theodosius came to the Empire, Arianism was entirely demolished by the Council of Constantinople, which was called the second General Council. . . . Meletius Bishop of Antioch presided in that Assembly." (Dupin, Cent. iv. c. 4.)

"A.D. 381. The emperor soon after convened a council of orthodox bishops. (Sozomen, l. vii. c. 7.)

"After this the emperor without delay summoned a synod of the prelates of his own faith. (Socrates, l. v. c. 8.)

"As soon as Theodosius obtained the imperial government . . . he assembled all the bishops of his part of the empire to Constantinople." (Theodoret, l. v. c. 6.)

"Before this Sentence [of the Council in Egypt, A.D. 430] was signified to Nestorius, he desired Theodosius to assemble a Council. . . . This emperor summoned one at Ephesus on Whitsuntide of the following Year.

"Q. Who was President of that Council?

"A. 'Twas certainly Cyril [of Alexandria]; but some [among them the Archbishop] pretend it was in the Name of the Pope." (Dupin, Cent. v. chap. 2. See his narrative in full, where the *pros* and *cons* are balanced.)

"Shortly after this the emperor's madate was issued directing the bishops in all places to assemble at Ephesus." (Socrates, l. vii. c. 34.)

"Hilarius . . . informed St. Leo of the manner in which things had been done : That Pope immediately assembled a Council and demanded [mark that !] of the Emperor to assemble a General Council in Italy, to judge of the Appeal of Flavianus. Theodosius made Answer, That he had already assembled a General Council at Ephesus, that the Matter was examined and

judged there, that Flavianus was found guilty, had been condemned, and it was needless and even impossible to do any more. St. Leo sent four Legates into the East to solicit [mark that !] a new judgment. Theodosius was dead when they arrived. Pulcheria, who had a great deal of Deference for the Bishop of Rome, persuaded the Emperor Martianus, her Husband, whom she had set upon the Throne after the death of Theodosius, to have that Affair examin'd in a Council. He presently appointed one at Nice, and when the Bishops were met there, he order'd them to go to Chalcedon, where the Council met for the first time on the 8th of October, 451. This Council was held in the great Church of St. Euphemia, in the Presence of the Commissioners, Officers of the Emperor, and Counsellors of State, who regulated every Motion of it, and were seated in the middle of the Assembly ; at their left were Paschasinus and Lucentius, Bishops, and the Priest Boniface, the Pope's Legates, then Anatolus of Constantinople, and after him Maximus of Antioch, and the Bishops of the East. On the Right was Dioscurus of Alexandria, Juvenal of Jerusalem, and the Bishops of Egypt, Illyria, and Palestine. The Holy Gospels were placed in the Middle. The Number of the Bishops, according to St. Leo, were about 600, and according to Liberatus and Photius, 630. However there are but 350 in the Subscriptions." (Dupin, Cent. v. chap. 2.)

I have given this long extract because of its importance, and because its 28th Canon, which I shall cite before I get through with this chapter, is absolutely decisive of the whole question.

From the foregoing we see that every one of the first four General Councils was summoned by the Emperor ; that, so far from the Pope's having the *prerogative* of consenting, or (as is implied in the Archbishop's assertion, if it is to the point) refusing to consent, the Great Leo, when he "demanded" the calling of a

fourth General Council, was politely snubbed by the Emperor, and thereupon was contented to send four legates to him, to "solicit" what had been refused to his "demand;" and that in not one of the four Councils did the Pope by his legates preside, for the Patriarch of Alexandria was at the Council of Ephesus in his own right.

So much for three of the Archbishop's assertions. There remains one more: "Before becoming a law, the acts of the Councils required the Pope's signature;" there is not the slightest foundation for this assertion: I challenge the Archbishop to bring forward a shadow of proof of it. He goes on, "just as our Congressional proceedings require the President's signature before they acquire the force of law." They *don't* require the President's signature for that purpose. There is a law on the statute-book, put there by the last Congress, in spite of the President's withholding his signature. We are not *quite* under an absolute monarchy yet, in church or state.

After all this, the Archbishop has the *courage* to say, "The Pope convenes, rules, and sanctions the Synods, not by courtesy, but by right;" and he asks, "Is not this a striking illustration of the Primacy?" It would be, if it were founded in truth.

"4. I shall refer to one more historical point in support of the Pope's jurisdiction over the whole Church. It is a most remarkable fact that *every nation hitherto converted from Paganism to Christianity, since the days of the Apostles* [the Sandwich Islands, for instance], *has received the light of faith from missionaries who were either especially commissioned by the See of Rome* [the Congregational missionaries to Hawaii, for instance] *or sent by Bishops in open communion with that See.* [*Italics the Archbishop's.*] This historical fact admits of no exception. Let me particularize:

"Ireland's Apostle is St. Patrick. Who commis-

sioned him? Pope St. Celestine, in the fifth century" (p. 134).

Bede says (l. i. c. 13), "In the eighth year of his (Theodosius's) reign, *Palladius* was sent by Celestinus, the Roman Pontiff, to the Scots that believed in Christ, to be their first bishop." The Scots, it should be remarked, were not at this time inhabitants of Scotland, but had their abode in the north of Ireland.

The AngloSaxon Chronicle says: "A. 430. This year *Palladius* the bishop was sent to the Scots by Pope Celestinus, that he might confirm their faith." Another MS. reads, "A. 430. This year *Patrick* was sent by pope Celestine to preach baptism to the Scots."

Gieseler (vol. i. § 108) speaking of Patrick's *Confessio*, or Autobiography, says: "In this work nothing is found about his journey to Rome, nor of a Papal authorization of a mission to Ireland, of which we find a relation first of all in Hericus Vita S. Germani, i. 12 (Act. SS. Jul. vii.) about 860."

St. Patrick himself, it seems, was not aware that the Pope sent him to Ireland, else he would certainly have mentioned it in his *Confessio*. Neither was any of his successors aware of it till 400 years after. St. Patrick was undoubtedly the Apostle of Ireland, but he went there of himself; he didn't wait for any Pope to send him there.

"St. Palladius is the Apostle of Scotland. Who sent him? The same Pontiff, Celestine" (p. 134).

How happens it then that St. Andrew is the Patron Saint of Scotland? The Archbishop seems to suppose that because Palladius was sent to the Scots, he was sent to Scotland; he seems not to be aware that the Scots were living, at that time, not in Scotland but in the north of Ireland, and that when, some hundreds of years later, they took possession of the northern part of Britain, they gave their name to it, as did the Angles, in like manner, theirs to the southern part.

“England received the faith from St. Augustine, a Benedictine monk, as all historians Catholic and non-Catholic testify. Who empowered Augustine to preach? Pope Gregory I., at the end of the sixth century” (p. 134).

So then, not only is Joseph of Arimathea in Britain a myth, but so also is “blessed Alban,” who, in 305, “suffered death,” as Venerable Bede testifies (l. i. c. 7), “on the 22d day of June, near the city of Verulam,” 299 years before the monk Augustine came into England; and Pelagius the British monk, who denied the doctrine of Original Sin, is another myth, and St. Augustine (not the monk) spent his mighty energies in demolishing a man of straw! Will the Archbishop allege that he means that the heathen Saxons, who conquered the Christian Britons and drove them out of England into Wales, “received the faith from St. Augustine.” Why didn’t he say so, then? Why didn’t he frankly tell his readers (most of whom are probably unfamiliar with ecclesiastical history) that Britain had been Christian, certainly four hundred years, probably five hundred, at the time of Augustine’s mission to its Saxon conquerors, instead of leaving them to infer that Christianity was *first* brought into that country by Augustine? Is that doing as he would be done by?

“St. Remigius established the faith in France, at the close of the fifth century. He was in active communion with the See of Peter” (p. 135).

Here we have another reckless *suppressio veri*, and consequent *suggestio falsi*. Gaul, like Britain, was a Christian country, and had been from Apostolic times. Irenæus was Bishop of Lyons three hundred years before what the Archbishop calls the *establishing* of the faith, which was really nothing more than baptizing Clovis, king of the Franks, who had at that time “established” themselves in that country.

But there is one nation that the Archbishop has *con-*

veniently forgotten. I mean Wales, which was and is as much a nation as Ireland and Scotland.

Wales, or, as it was then called, *Britannia Secunda*, embraced, in the time of the Romans, all that part of Britain west of the Severn, including Hereford and Worcester. Within this part of the island the Britons were driven by the victorious Saxons, and here they withstood the invaders, and were in undisputed possession at the time when Augustine came into Engand. Now these Britons were Christians, and had been for at least 400 years ; for says Lingard, *Antiquities of the Anglo-Saxon Church* (chap. i. note 5), "that the Christian faith was publicly professed in Britain, before the close of the second century, is clear from incontestable authority." And he refers to Tertullian and Origen, both of whom were living at that time, in proof of it. About a hundred years later, the Bishops of London, York, and Lincoln sat in the Council of Arles, in Gaul, A.D. 314, and their names are subscribed to its proceedings. But these Sees had become, for the time being, extinct, when Augustine came into England. But the Britons in Wales were then under an Archbishop and seven Bishops ; and these seven Bishops, with Dinoh the Abbot of Bangor, by appointment met Augustine, on the borders of their territory, at a place afterwards called, from that meeting, Augustine's Oak. "He (Augustine)," says Bede (l. ii. c. 2), "said to them, 'You act in many particulars contrary to our custom, or rather the custom of the universal church, and yet if you will comply with me in these three points—viz., to keep Easter at the due time ; to administer baptism, by which we are again born to God, according to the custom of the holy Roman Apostolic Church ; and jointly with us to preach the word of God to the English nation, we will readily tolerate all the other things you do, though contrary to our customs.' They answered they would do none of those things, nor re-

ceive him as their archbishop." Bede, whose prejudice against them is seen throughout his narrative, does not inform us what reason they gave for their refusal ; but Spelman (*Con. Brit. an.* 601, T. i. p. 108), as quoted by Bingham (*Antiq.* l. ii. c. 18, s. 2), says that Dinot "told Austin in the Name of all the Britannick Churches, That they owed no other Obedience to the Pope of Rome, than they did to every Godly Christian, to love every one in his Degree in perfect Charity : Other Obedience than this, they knew none due to him whom he named Pope, etc. But they were under the Government of the Bishop of Caer-Leon upon Uske, who was their Overseer under God."

Schelstrate, replying to Stillingfleet, objects that the Manuscript followed by Spelman is spurious ; but Bingham (l. ix. c. 1. s. 11) examines his objections in detail, and shows unanswerably that they are worthless. The only one that has the slightest plausibility is this, that Caer-Leon upon Uske was not at this time the archiepiscopal See, it having been transferred, a hundred years before, to Menevia, now St. David's. To which Bingham answers that it is not at all uncommon to retain the name of a transferred or extinct See, of which he gives instances, one of them being that "the Bishop of the Isle Man now retains the Title of *Episcopus Sodorensis*, because Sodora and all the Hebrides, or Islands on the West of Scotland, were once part of his Diocese, though now for many ages they have been separated from it."

Of the eight Sees of these seven Bishops and their Archbishop, all of which were in existence at least a hundred years before the coming of Augustine, and therefore a hundred years before the See of Canterbury, two, Lan-Patern and Morgan, are extinct ; the other six, viz., Hereford, Worcester, Landaff, Bangor, St. Asaph, and St. David's, have existed continuously from that day to this ; a standing visible proof of a

Christianity still existing in Britain, that was *not* brought there "by missionaries in subjection to the Holy See." If it had been, those British Christians in the time of Augustine would not have had customs so different, and been so tenacious of them. All the indications—in particular the liturgical remains—point in a different direction—namely, to St. John as the source, and the Church of Gaul as the channel. As on a former and memorable occasion, that "other disciple did outrun Peter, and came first" to Britain: but Peter followed afar off. And when, seventeen hundred years later, the inheritance *in its fulness* was to be "transmitted to another country speaking the same language—descendants, in short, of the mother country," *again* that other disciple did outrun Peter; and *again* Peter lagged behind.* Bishop Seabury was consecrated in 1784; Bishops White and Provost in 1787; the Most Rev. John Carroll in 1790. The Archbishop's claim to these United States, then, on the score of priority, will not stand. As little will it on any other score. The hierarchy of which he is the head did not come from the mother country, for the excellent reason that there was no Roman hierarchy there at that time; none from the death of Cardinal Pole, a few hours after that of "Bloody Mary," till the creation of the See of Westminster, and the appointment of Dr. Wiseman to it, in our day. *Hiatus ingens, sed non valde deflendus*. For the first eleven years of Queen Elizabeth's reign (as I have remarked in a former chapter—and it cannot be too often repeated) there was but one organization in England that called itself a church—namely, that which was then, and had been from the beginning, and is now, the Church of England. In the twelfth year of her reign began the "Anglo-Roman Schism." Then, for the first time in English history, was formed, and par-

* I have taken a sentence or two here from *The Afterpiece to the Comedy of Convocation*.

tially organized, a religious Sect, which received its complete organization only within our own day, and which even then did not attempt to claim the old historic Sees, but contented itself with establishing new ones, "Westminster, Beverly, Birmingham," etc. (all *Brummagem*), thereby proclaiming its modern origin. Of this earliest English *Sect* they who first settled Maryland were members, and they brought the Sect with them; and here it is now, and the Archbishop is the head of it. A Sect doesn't change its nature by crossing the ocean. *Cælum, non animum, mutant qui trans mare currunt*. The inhabitants of Florida, Louisiana, etc., were members of a (corrupt) branch of the Church, but they have made themselves members of a sect by their *merger* into the Roman Sect in the United States. And if they had not, it wouldn't help them; for no church has, or can have, *mission* from Christ to preach Tridentine Romanism anywhere. The less said by the Archbishop, therefore, about his claim to the United States, the better.

"Henry VIII. was a stout defender of the Pope's supremacy until *Clement VII. refused to legalize his adultery*" (p. 138).

This is false, as I have already (page 34) shown from Lingard.

"You have seen that the Bishop of Rome is appointed not by man, but by Jesus Christ, President of the Christian commonwealth" (p. 138).

That is just what we haven't seen; and what the Council of Chalcedon didn't see either; as witness its twenty-eighth Canon, and the third Canon of the Council of Constantinople to which it refers. This last runs thus: "The Bishop of Constantinople shall have the Primacy of honor after the Bishop of Rome, because that Constantinople is new Rome." The other, the twenty-eighth of Chalcedon, is as follows:

"We following in all things the decisions of the holy

Fathers, and acknowledging the Canon [the third of Constantinople, above cited] of the 150 most religious Bishops which has just been read, do also determine and decree the same things respecting the privileges of the most holy city of Constantinople, New Rome. For the Fathers properly gave the Primacy to the Throne of the elder Rome, because that was the imperial city. And the 150 most religious Bishops [at the Council of Constantinople], being moved with the same intention, gave equal privileges to the most holy Throne of New Rome, judging with reason, that the city which was honored with the sovereignty and senate, and which enjoyed equal privileges with the elder royal Rome, should also be magnified like her in ecclesiastical matters, being the second after her." (Hammond, *Six Ecumenical Councils*.) * The rest of the Canon merely specifies what Metropolitans and other Bishops the Bishop of Constantinople shall ordain.

"Q. Did the Pope's Legates suffer those Privileges to be granted to the Church of Constantinople?

"A. No : Next day they complain'd that after their and the Commissioners Departure, Rules had been made which they thought contrary to the Canons and Discipline of the Church. They demanded that they might be read over again, which they were accordingly. Paschasinus and Lucentius [the Pope's legates] oppos'd the Right granted to the Bishop of Constantinople. The other Bishops of the Council stood to what they had done. The Commissioners concluded that the Bishop of Rome ought to have the Primacy and Honour ; That he of Constantinople ought to enjoy the same Prerogative of Honour. . . . The Pope's Legates demanded, that the Acts of that Regulation should be cancelled ; or, if they would not do that, that their Protest might remain join'd to the Acts.

* See the original Greek, in *Gieseler*, vol. I, § 93, n. 14.

Notwithstanding this Protestation, the Bishops declar'd that they persisted ; and the Commissioners, without taking any Notice of what had been said by the Pope's Legates, decided, that the whole Synod had approv'd their Resolution." (Dupin, *ut supra*.)

Let the reader now turn back to page 156, and read again the account I have there given from Dupin, the Archbishop's own historian, of the composition and organization of this by far the largest Council of the undivided Church ever held ; four times as large as that of Constantinople ; three times as large as that of Ephesus ; twice as large as that of Nice ; and he will be prepared to appreciate the value of the testimony—and it is as testimony that I cite it—of the 630 Bishops, representative men, of whom it was composed. They testify, with one voice, to three points : first, that the primacy was one of honor, not of jurisdiction ; secondly, that it was given by the Fathers, not by Christ ; thirdly, that it was given to " the (Episcopal) Throne of the elder Rome," not because it was the See of Peter, but because Rome was the " imperial city." Testimony could not be more explicit. And it makes no difference with it, that the Pope refused his assent ; for even if that assent had been necessary (which it was not) to give it the force of law, it was of course not necessary to its force as testimony. Viewed in that light, it was 630 Bishops on one side ; the Bishop of Rome on the other. And the testimony of these 630 is, that they know nothing of any primacy, still less supremacy, of Peter, handed down to the Bishops of Rome as his Successors. This, of itself, is absolutely conclusive of the whole matter.

How Rome came at last to wield so widespread a supremacy is easily explained. At the time of the meeting of the second General Council, in 381, there were three Patriarchal Sees, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria. The Council added a fourth, Constantinople.

The first three were of Apostolic origin ; the last, of a later date. " Thus," in the words of Swete, *England versus Rome* (p. 56), " the constitution of the Church was brought as nearly as possible into correspondence with that of the empire : four great ecclesiastical Patriarchates answered to the four Prætorian præfectures which divided the civil administration of the Roman world.

" Next followed, almost as a matter of course, a struggle for precedence between the greater Patriarchs." Antioch and Alexandria were Apostolical, but not Imperial ; Constantinople was Imperial, but not Apostolical ; Rome was both Imperial and Apostolical. Add to this, that while Rome was the only Patriarchate in the West, the allegiance of the East was divided among the other three, and each, in turn, in its rivalry with the other two, appealed to Rome, not as an umpire, still less as a sovereign, but as a partisan, and she, in taking sides, followed policy rather than principle, and her growing ascendancy follows as a matter of course.

But the growth was slow. Even as late as the end of the sixth century, Gregory the Great denounced him who should call himself Universal Bishop, as the " fore-runner of anti-Christ ;" and in a letter to Eulogius of Alexandria (l. vii. ep. 36, cited by Bower, *History of the Popes*) thus writes : " If you give more to me than is due to me, you rob yourself of what is due to you. I choose to be distinguished by my manners, and not by titles. Nothing can redound to my honor that redounds to the dishonor of my brethren. I place my honor in maintaining them in theirs. If you call me ' universal pope,' you thereby own yourself to be no pope.* Let no such titles therefore be mentioned, or ever heard, among us. Your holiness says, in your letter, that I commanded you. I commanded you? I

* Pope (*papa*) was originally the title of all Bishops.

know who you are, who I am. In rank you are my brother, in your manners my father. I therefore did not command ; and beg you will henceforth ever forbear that word.' I only pointed out to you what I thought it was right you should know."

Grand old Pope ! How he dwarfs the popelings of a later day ! Who would have thought that his Successor, next but one in the line, Boniface III., only ten years later, would assume the very title of " Universal Bishop," and get it settled on himself and his successors by the usurping Emperor Phocas ; thus showing himself the forerunner of anti-Christ (Gregory being witness), if not anti-Christ himself ?

CHAPTER XI.

INFALLIBILITY OF THE POPES.

THIS chapter need not detain us long, as most of its arguments have been already answered in the examination of the last four chapters. There is but one sentence in the first three pages that calls for criticism :

" The avowed enemies of the Church charge only five or six Popes with immorality" (p. 141).

In answer to this I affirm, on the authority of Bower, who, I suppose, is, in the Archbishop's opinion, one of " the avowed enemies of the Church," that among those who are no credit to the Church in a moral (not to say spiritual) point of view, though not more than " five or six" of them are *monsters* of immorality, are the following : ' Sabinian, John VIII., Boniface VI., Stephen VI. (VII. ?), Christopher, Sergius III., John X., John XII., John XIX., Benedict IX., Gregory VI., Innocent III., Boniface VIII., Clement V., John

XXII., Urban VI., John XXIII., Paul II., Sixtus IV., Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., Julius II., Leo X., Clement VII., Paul III., Julius III., Pius IV.” If we count craft, and dissimulation, and persecution of heretics, immoral, the list will be swelled three or four fold.

“What, then, is the real doctrine of Infallibility? It simply means that the Pope, as successor of St. Peter, Prince of the Apostles, by virtue of the promises of Jesus Christ, is preserved from error of judgment when he promulgates to the Church a decision on faith or morals.

“The Pope, therefore, be it known, is not the maker of the divine law; he is only its expounder. . . .

“In a word, the Sovereign Pontiff is to the Church, though in a more eminent degree, what the Chief Justice is to the United States. . . . The Chief Justice, with his associate judges, examines the case, and then pronounces judgment upon it; and this decision is final, irrevocable, and practically infallible. . . .

“When a dispute arises in the Church regarding the sense of Scripture, the subject is referred to the Pope for final adjudication. The sovereign Pontiff, before deciding the case, gathers around him his venerable colleagues, the Cardinals of the Church; or he calls a council of his associate judges of faith, the Bishops of Christendom; or he has recourse to other lights which the Holy Ghost may suggest to him. Then after mature and prayerful deliberation, he pronounces judgment, and his sentence is final, irrevocable, and infallible” (pp. 143-145).

As I have already remarked, near the beginning of the last chapter, the Archbishop is peculiarly infelicitous in drawing analogies from the civil institutions of his country. His representation of the power of deciding a case being in the Chief Justice alone, “his associate judges” being merely advisers—for that is the intended meaning of his artfully constructed ambiguo-

ous sentence, or else it is no illustration—is the creation of his own brain ; there is nothing in the reality to correspond to it. The Chief Justice—I mention this, of course, merely for the information of the Archbishop ; his non-Roman readers are well aware of it, ignorant as he may think them—has no more voice in deciding a question than each and every one of his associates. A bare majority decides, even on the weightiest questions, and it is not by any means uncommon for the Chief Justice to be in the minority. But suppose the Pope, having summoned his Cardinals to “examine” with him a question of “faith or morals,” and forty of them having responded to the summons, twenty-one should “pronounce judgment” on the question, over the heads of the Pope and the other nineteen ! What would be the consequence ? Why, it would be said, and said truly, that the whole Roman judicature had been revolutionized. So much for the Archbishop’s fancy sketch of the United States supreme judicature. When it shall have become a true sketch—when the power of “deciding” shall have been lodged in the Chief Justice alone, the associate judges having only an advisory voice, the “man on horseback” will have come, and the “man of sin” will be close behind. Yet the difference, according to the Archbishop, would be only one of degree ; for he says, as we have seen, “the Sovereign Pontiff is to the Church, though in a more eminent *degree*, what the Chief Justice is to the United States.” There are those, strange as it may seem to the Archbishop, who think the difference between a republic and an absolute monarchy one of *kind*.

But how are these “venerable colleagues” of the Pope, whom he “gathers around him,” the Cardinals, namely, appointed ? Why, by the Pope himself. And how are “his associate judges of faith, the Bishops of [Roman] Christendom,” appointed ? Why, again, by the Pope himself. The overwhelming majority of the

Cardinals and Bishops who sat in the late Council of the Vatican, and declared Pope Pius the Ninth infallible, were the appointees of that same Pope Pius the Ninth ; only a *very small* proportion were the appointees of his predecessor. I have before me " Sadlier's *Catholic Directory, Almanac and Ordo* for the Year of our Lord 1869," the very year the Council met. From the list of Cardinals (pp. 49-51) I find that 49 were appointed by Pope Pius, 10 by his predecessor ; of the Bishops in the United States (pp. 52-54), 48 by Pope Pius, 8 by his predecessor ; of the Bishops in British America (Part II., pp. 3, 4) 22 by Pope Pius, 1 by his predecessor ; of the Bishops in Ireland (omitting Archbishop Cullen, whose name appears among the Cardinals) (Part II., p. 71), 26 by Pope Pius, 1 by his predecessor ; of the Bishops in Great Britain (p. 74), 17 by Pope Pius, *none* by his predecessor. The date of the consecration of these latter is not given, but as the Anglo-Roman hierarchy was created by Pope Pius, it is not probable that the consecration of any on the list dates back to his predecessor. Taking the aggregate of the Bishops, we have 113 appointed by Pope Pius, and only 10 by his predecessor. If this is a fair criterion for the rest of the Roman Bishops (and it can't be far out of the way), then of the 520 Bishops that were present, according to Quirinus (*Letters from Rome on the Council*, Letter 66), at the final vote, only 42 owed their elevation to Pope Gregory ; the remaining 478 were the appointees of Pope Pius. Practically, then, it was Pope Pius the Ninth that declared Pope Pius the Ninth infallible !

The Archbishop brings forward three passages of Scripture to prove the infallibility of the Pope, to wit, " Mat. 16 ; Luke 22 : 31, 32 ; John 21 : 16, 17." The first, " Thou art Peter," etc., and the last, " Feed my sheep," etc., I have already disposed of. The second the Archbishop gives thus :

“ ‘Behold Satan hath desired to have you (my Apostles), that he may sift *you* as wheat. But I have prayed for *thee* (Peter) that thy faith fail not ; and thou being once converted, confirm [in our Version, “strengthen”] thy brethren.’ It is worthy of note that Jesus prays only for Peter ” (p. 146).

How does the Archbishop know that ? There is no “only” in the record ; it is a sheer assumption of the Archbishop’s ; all that the language necessarily involves is, that Christ prayed *specially* for Peter.

“ And why for Peter in particular ? Because on his shoulders was to rest the burden of the Church ” (p. 147).

Not so. The conclusion is altogether too big for the premises. The obvious reason—obvious from the two verses next following—is that Peter was specially prayed for because specially in danger ; specially (from his overweening self-confidence) accessible to temptation. And this the result showed ; for he alone of the eleven denied his Master. “ And when thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren.” As much as to say, “ Make use of thy bitter experience for the fortifying of thy tempted brethren ” (D. Brown). He that can see in this an *official* strengthening of the other ten, and their successors, to the end of time, must be keener-eyed than a lynx, or a hawk, or an eagle !

“ For optics sharp it takes, I ween,
To see what is not to be seen.”

“ We know that the prayer of Jesus is always heard. Therefore the faith of Peter will always be firm ” (p. 147).

Let us put this into syllogistic form :

1. The prayer of Jesus is always heard.
2. Jesus prayed that Peter’s faith might not fail.
3. Therefore Peter’s faith will always be firm.

Here we have an assumption in every member. It

is *assumed* in the major premise that to hear prayer is to grant the specific request. It is *assumed* in the minor premise that not to fail, on a specific occasion (which is, so far as we are informed, all that was prayed for), is never to fail. It is *assumed* in the conclusion that not to fail is to be firm. This *last* assumption makes weak faith no faith at all. The *second* assumption is so manifest that it needs only to be mentioned. The *first* assumption is contradicted by fact. The faith of Peter did fail temporarily notwithstanding the prayer; it was, to say the least, under an eclipse; and if it was under an eclipse then, why may it not be, in the person of his alleged successor, under an eclipse now? Furthermore, Jesus prayed (St. John 17 : 20, 21) for his followers, to the end of time, "that they all may be one." *Are they all one?* What says the Archbishop himself? "No one will deny that in our days there exists a vast multitude of sects, which are daily multiplying. No one will deny that this multiplying of creeds is a crying scandal and a great stumbling block in the way of the conversion of heathen nations. No one can deny that these divisions in the Christian family are traceable to the assumption of the right of private judgment" (p. 106).

It will be observed that, by the Archbishop's own admission, these "divisions" are in "the Christian family;" that very family for which Jesus prayed that they all might be one. It is plain, then, from the Archbishop himself, that "the prayer of Jesus" is *not* "always heard," in the shape of a bestowal of the specific thing prayed for; and so his inference about Peter falls to the ground.

So much for "the faith of Peter." Grant the Archbishop an assumption in the major, an assumption in the minor, and an assumption in the conclusion, and he is irresistible. But where *did* he get his logic?

Having got through with his Scripture proofs, the

Archbishop next appeals to three "General Councils," as he calls them—the Eighth, in Constantinople in 869, the Second of Lyons in 1274, and that of Florence in 1439; but as the earliest of the three was held more than eight hundred years after the death of St. Peter, and "was attended by about 100 Eastern Bishops" only, and "was annulled in 879," only ten years later, "by a synod of 384 Bishops at Constantinople, and has always since been rejected by the Eastern Church;" and as the second of the three "was never accounted ecumenical in the East, the Eastern Patriarchs and Bishops not having sent any deputies to it, and whatever consent some of them gave to the union [of the Greek and Roman Churches] having been extorted by the violence of the Emperor Michael Palæologus, who was desirous of obtaining the political assistance of the Roman See;" and as the claims of both of these to ecumenicity were repudiated by the last of the three—that of Florence—officially styling itself the Eighth; and as this last "was immediately rejected in the Eastern Churches, and has never since been recognized by them;" for all which facts, with abundance of Roman authorities in proof of them, see Palmer on the Church, edited by Bishop Whittingham, New York, D. Appleton & Co., 1841, vol. ii., pp. 203, 216, and 222, I shall dismiss them with the simple remark that the appeal to them by the Archbishop shows how desperate his case is; for if there were a shadow of evidence on his side in the first six universally admitted General Councils, he would be only too glad to bring it forward. It is a remarkable fact—I say it after a careful search through his book with reference to this very point, in which search I believe I have not overlooked anything; if I have, I am open to correction—I say, it is a remarkable fact that (with the exception of a line from the Niceno-Constantinopolitan Creed on page 56) throughout his whole book he never once quotes a single sentence from

any one of the first six General Councils. They are every one of them against him, and he knows it. Hence the wide berth he gives them.

On page 150 he argues the infallibility of the "visible Head," because "the body," of which he is the head, "is infallible;" because "it is, as St. Paul says, 'without spot or wrinkle, or any such thing.'" But St. Paul doesn't say that; he is speaking (Eph. 5:25, 27) not of what it "is," but of what it is to be. He is exhorting husbands to love their wives, "even as Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might . . . present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing." When? At "the marriage supper of the Lamb:" "for the marriage of the Lamb *is come*, and his wife hath *made herself ready*. And to her was granted that she should be *arrayed in fine linen, clean and white*; for the *fine linen is the righteousness of saints*. And he saith unto me, Write, Blessed are they which are called unto the marriage supper of the Lamb" (Rev. 19:7-9).

"The Council of the Vatican in promulgating, in 1870, the Pope's Infallibility, did not create a new doctrine, but confirmed an old one" (p. 151). "This was equivalent to the declaration that the doctrine in question had been revealed to the Apostles, and had come down to us from them, either by Scripture or tradition" (p. 29).

If so, how comes it that the Rev. Thomas Maguire, in the Report of the Discussion between him and the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope,* says, on page 47, "I may

* "Authenticated Report of the Discussion which took place between the Rev. Richard T. P. Pope, and the Rev. Thomas Maguire in the Lecture Room of the Dublin Institution on the 19th, 20th, 21st, 23d, 24th, and 25th of April, 1827. Dublin: R. Coyne, Capel-St. R. M. Tims, Grafton St. and W. Curry, Jun. & Co. Sackville-St. 1827."

Mr. Maguire is the original of the famous "Father Tom and the Pope;" though how he was made to sit for that portrait, is not obvious; for the likeness is by no means striking. The imaginary Father Tom is rude and

premise that the Pope's infallibility is not a doctrine of mine, nor of any Catholic"? And on page 60, "Here [St. Matt. 16:18, "On this rock," etc.] is the infallibility promised by our Lord, and claimed by the Catholic Church, and not the infallibility of the Pope, which my learned adversary would cram down the throats of Catholics, 'velint nolint'—as an article of Catholic faith"? And again, page 63, "I am opposed to the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. It is imposed upon me by Mr. Pope—but I have already stated that it forms no part of the doctrine of the Catholic Church, and is not received by the Catholics throughout the world"? And how comes it that Döllinger was excommunicated for denying it *after* the decree of the Council, and was *not* excommunicated for denying it *before* that decree, if it was as much a doctrine of the Church before as after? And how comes it that Milner, in his *End of Controversy* (Baltimore, John Murphy & Co., 1859)—a work specially commended to our Bishops in a printed Address to them by the Archbishop's predecessor, the Most Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick—says, of another doctrine, defined within the last quarter of a century (Letter xii.), "The church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and *several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten Word*; and *therefore* leaves her children to form their own opinions concerning them"?

Here it occurs to me to ask, Who is the *Custodian* of "the unwritten Word"? Is it the infallible Pope? If

rollicking. The real one is kindly and genial; and so modest, withal that he wins on you ere you are aware. It is impossible to read his part of the "Discussion" without feeling a love for the man, whatever may be thought of the cause he advocates. For learning, and candor, and accuracy of citation, it is in refreshing contrast with the "little volume" of the Archbishop.

so, how does he hand it down to his successor, seeing he is dead before his successor is appointed? Is it the infallible Church? And if so, what is meant by the Church? Is it the Church diffused? And is each individual member of it throughout the world the custodian of "the unwritten Word?" Or is the custody in a select few? And if so, who are these select few? And are *they* infallible? Anyhow, what is an infallibility (whether of Church or Pope) good for, that doesn't know what it is put in trust with, and "*therefore*" leaves its children to wrangle, in unseemly wise, for several hundred years, over points that afterwards turn out to have been all along articles of faith, handed down from the beginning? And where, all the while, was that boasted unity on those points? And where *is* it now, on those "several other disputed points," which, for aught we know, may be even now articles of faith that have come down to us in "the unwritten Word," since Infallibility itself, though it has not yet found out that they are, has just as little found out that they are not?—After all, is the infallibility of the Pope so certain? Oh yes! says the Archbishop; there are instances of its actual exercise:

"Thus, in the third century, Pope St. Stephen reverses the decision of St. Cyprian of Carthage, and of a Council of African Bishops, regarding a question of baptism" (p. 152).

Why didn't the Archbishop add [what he well knew to be the fact] that St. Cyprian called a Council of African Bishops, which reaffirmed the action of the former Council in spite of Pope Stephen's reversal of it? and that St. Cyprian wrote to Pompeius (Epist. 74) that "our brother (not father) Stephen . . . among other things either haughty, or not pertinent, *or self-contradictory*, which he wrote without experience and without foresight (*inter cetera vel superba, vel ad rem non pertinentia, vel sibi ipsi contraria*, quæ imperite atque im-

provide scripsit), even went so far as to say, 'If any one, therefore, from any heresy whatever (*a quacunque hæresi*) shall come to us, let him be received simply by imposition of hands.' . . . He forbade to baptize one coming "from any heresy whatever;" that is, he pronounced the baptisms of all heretics valid and lawful (*omnium hæreticorum baptismata justa esse et legitima judicavit*);" and that Firmilian of Cæsarea, to whom Cyprian communicated the doings of Stephen, wrote in reply (Epist. Cypr. 75), "I am justly indignant at the open and manifest folly of Stephen (*juste indignor ad hanc tam apertam et manifestam Stephani stultitiam*)"? It is plain that neither Cyprian nor Firmilian believed in Pope Stephen's infallibility. As little did St. Augustine, who, two hundred years later, writing on the part St. Cyprian took in this controversy, 'excuses him,' says Dupin, "because that Matter had not been yet decided by the Authority of a full or general Council." The decision of (the infallible) Pope Stephen, in St. Augustine's opinion, wasn't binding on St. Cyprian. Dupin continues: "The first Council of Arles [(A.D. 314) at which were "200 Bishops," says Dr. Pusey (*Councils of the Church*, p. 98) "from Gaul, Italy, Africa, Spain, Sicily, Sardinia, Britain," and which "was convened by Constantine"] set up the Distinction of Heretics who baptiz'd in the Name of the Trinity, and those who did not so: It ordains that the latter should be rebaptiz'd, but that the former should not. . . . The Western Church embraced this Opinion" (*Dupin*, First Three Centuries, Chap. v).

So, then, the very act of "Pope St. Stephen" appealed to by the Archbishop as an instance of an infallible decision on a point of faith (for it was not a point of morals, and infallibility has to do only with those two) proves the reverse; for Stephen *forbade* to baptize one coming from any heresy whatever (*a quacunque*

hæresi), and the Council *commanded* to baptize one coming from an anti-trinitarian heresy ; thus reversing the decision of Pope Stephen ; and the Western Church, with Pope Sylvester at its head, accepted the reversal.

“ Pope St. Innocent I., in the fifth century, condemns the Pelagian heresy, in reference to which St. Augustine wrote this memorable sentence : ‘ The acts of two Councils were sent to the Apostolic See whence an answer was returned ; the *question is ended*. Would to God that the error had also ceased ’ ” (p. 152).

Why did St. Augustine say “ the question is ended ? ” Not because he recognized the infallibility of the Pope, for we have just seen he did not ; else he would not have excused Cyprian for setting Stephen’s decision at nought, on the ground that a General Council had not spoken ? Why, then ? Because, as Bower (*History of the Popes*, Philad. 1847, vol. i. p. 146) well explains it, St. Augustine suspected Innocent of a leaning towards Pelagianism, and feared he might side with the heretics ; in which case there might have been a protracted conflict between the Pope and the African Bishops. When therefore he found him siding with the two Councils, he felt and said, “ the question is ended.”

Having thus given two instances of papal infallibility, one from the third century, the other from the fifth, both of which I have shown to be no instances, the Archbishop leaps, at one bound, over *nine* centuries, and comes to “ the fourteenth ; ” I shall therefore leap over the other five, and come to the nineteenth.

“ The Church, therefore, like civil powers, must have a permanent and stationary supreme tribunal to interpret its laws, and to determine cases of religious controversy.

“ What constitutes this permanent supreme court of the Church ? Does it consist of the Bishops assembled in General Council ? No ; because this is not an ordinary but an extraordinary tribunal, which meets, on

an average, only once in a hundred years. . . . The Pope, then, as Head of the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church, constitutes, with just reason, this supreme tribunal" (pp. 153, 154).

To this I reply : If "the Holy Roman Church" managed to rub along for 1837 years, to wit, from the year of grace 33 to the year of grace 1870, without so much as knowing that she had *that* infallible tribunal, "the Holy Catholic Church" will make shift to rub along in the same way for another 1837 years.

When I began this chapter I thought and said that it need not detain us long ; but when I found the Archbishop presenting weapon after weapon with the handle toward me, the temptation was irresistible to clutch the handle and give him the point.

I close with a single reflection. We are told by St. James that "the husbandman waiteth for the precious fruit of the earth, and hath long patience." But his patience is nothing to that of the Archbishop, who puts in the seed of infallibility, with the consciousness that he cannot reasonably expect a return within sixty generations ! For if Infallibility itself, with all the Archbishop's proofs before it, was eighteen hundred years in finding out that it *was* infallible, surely fallibility can't be expected to find it out in less than twice eighteen hundred.

CHAPTER XII.

TEMPORAL POWER OF THE POPES.

"FOR the clearer understanding of the origin and gradual growth of the Temporal Power of the Popes, we may divide the history of the Church into three great epochs" (p. 157).

There is no need of any division of the history. The

Temporal Power was unknown till 755. It originated in Forgery, and was enlarged by fraud, and perpetuated by force. The Archbishop shall tell his story first; and then Janus, backed by Gieseler and Bower, and the authorities severally produced by them, shall tell his.

“ In 754, Astolphus, King of the Lombards, invaded Italy, capturing some Italian cities, and threatening to advance on Rome” (p. 162).

“ In this emergency, Stephen [the third (or, as some reckon, the second) Pope of that name], who sees that no time is to be lost, crosses the Alps in person, approaches Pepin, King of France, and begs that powerful monarch to protect the Italian people, who were utterly abandoned by those that ought to be their defenders [viz., the Emperor and his forces]. The pious King, after paying his homage to the Pope, sets out for Italy with his army, defeats the invading Lombards, and places the Pope at the head of the conquered provinces.

“ Charlemagne, the successor of Pepin, not only confirms the grant of his father, but increases the temporal domain of the Pope by donating him some additional provinces” (p. 163).

The Archbishop, very discreetly, tells only half the story. Now let Janus tell the other half.

“ After the middle of the eighth century, the famous Donation of Constantine was concocted at Rome. It is based on the earlier fifth-century legend of his cure from leprosy, and baptism by Pope Silvester, which is repeated at length, and the Emperor is said, out of gratitude, to have bestowed Italy and the western provinces * on the Pope, and also to have made many regulations about the honorary prerogatives and dress of the Roman clergy. The Pope is, moreover, represented

* “ Lombardy, Venetia, and Istria.”

as lord and master of all bishops, and having authority over the four great thrones [patriarchal Sees] of Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem.

“The forgery betrayed its Roman authorship in every line ; it is self-evident that a cleric of the Lateran Church was the composer. The document was obviously intended to be shown to the Frankish king, Pepin, and must have been compiled just before 754. Constantine relates in it how he served the Pope as his groom, and led his horse some distance. This induced Pepin to offer the Pope a homage so foreign to Frankish ideas, and the Pope told him from the first that he expected, not a gift, but restitution from him and his Franks.*

. . . In this way it was made clear to Pepin that he had simply to reject the demands of the Greek Imperial Court about the restoration of its territory as unauthorized.

“It would indeed be incomprehensible how Pepin could have been induced to give the Exarchate, with twenty towns, to the Pope, who never possessed it, and thereby to draw on himself the enmity of the still powerful Imperial Court, merely that the lamps in the Roman churches might be furnished with oil,† had he not been shown that the Pope had a right to it by the gift of Constantine, and terrified by the threat of vengeance from the Prince of the Apostles, if his property should be withheld. There was no fear of such documents as the Epistle of Peter and the Donation of Constantine being critically examined at the warlike Court of Pepin. Men who might be written to that their bodies and souls would be eternally lacerated and tormented in hell if they did not fight against the ene-

* “There can be no doubt as to the Roman origin of the ‘Donation.’ The Jesuit Cantel has rightly recognized this in his *Hist. Metrop. Urb.* p. 195. He thinks a Roman subdeacon, John, was the author.”

† “This was always given in the covetous begging letters of the Popes as their main ground for demanding the gifts of land they wished for.”

mies of the Church, believed readily enough that Constantine had given Italy to Pope Silvester. Those were days of darkness in France, and in the complete extinction of all learning there was not a single man about Pepin whose sharp-sightedness the Roman agents had reason to dread.

“One is tempted to ascribe to the same hand the Epistle of St. Peter to his ‘adopted son’ the King of the Franks, which appeared also at this moment of great danger and distress, as well as of lofty hopes and pretensions—a fabrication which for strangeness and audacity has never been exceeded. Entreating and promising victory, and then again threatening the pains of hell, the Prince of the Apostles adjures the Franks to deliver Rome and the Roman Church. The Epistle really went from Rome to the Frankish kingdom, and seems to have produced its effect there.*

“Twenty years later the need was felt at Rome of a more extensive invention or interpolation. Pepin had given the Pope the Exarchate, taken away from the Longobards, with Ravenna for its capital, and twenty other towns of the Emilia, Flaminia, and Pentapolis, or the triangle of coast between Bologna, Comacchio, and Ancona. More he had been unable to give, for this was all the territory the Longobards had shortly before acquired, and were now obliged to give up. In 774 Pepin’s son Charles the Great (Charlemagne), after taking Pavia, became king of the Longobardic territory, stretching far southwards. No more could be said about the gift of Constantine. . . . So a document was laid before the King in Rome, professing to be his father’s gift or promise (*promissio*) of Kiersy. He renewed it as it was shown him, and gave away thereby the greater part of Italy.” (Janus, *The Pope and the*

* “It was incorporated in the official collection of the *Codex Carolinus*. Cf. Cenni, *Monum. Dominat. Pontif. i.* 150.”

Council, sect. vii.) See also *Gieseler*, Period iii., sect. 20, and Bower, *History of the Popes*, Stephen II., with the authorities cited by them. Gieseler gives (n. 21) a part of the *Donatio* in the original Latin. Bower gives a translation of a portion of the "Epistle of St. Peter." Here is a taste of it :

"Simon Peter, a servant and apostle of Jesus Christ, to the three most excellent kings, Pepin, Charles, and Carloman ; to all the holy bishops. . . . Grace unto you and peace be multiplied.

"I am the apostle Peter to whom it was said, Thou art Peter. . . . It has pleased the Almighty God that my body should rest in this city. . . . And can you, my most Christian sons, stand by unconcerned, and see it insulted by the most wicked of nations? . . . Our lady, the virgin Mary, mother of God, joins in earnestly entreating, nay, and commands you to hasten, to run, to fly, to the relief of my favorite people . . . with me the French are, and ever have been, the first, the best, the most deserving of all nations?" etc., etc., etc.

Such were the documents palmed off upon Pepin and Charlemagne to induce them to make over to the Pope the territories they had rescued from the Lombards. It was a shameless transaction, on the Roman side, from beginning to end ; conceived in forgery, brought forth in fraud, and the result perpetuated by force down to the year of grace 1870, when, God be praised, the Successor of Stephen and Adrian was made to disgorge the ill-gotten gain ; whereat one universal whine—five hundred years earlier it would have been a howl—arose from all Ultramontane Christendom over "the little ewe-lamb" (p. 166)—as though, in the putative Scripture parallel, Uriah were the thief, and David the "legitimate owner"—and over the "Prisoner of the Vatican," as with ineffably silly twaddle he was called by those who knew, all the while, that he was as free as

you or I, reader, to come out of the Vatican, and go through the streets of Rome, and to the ends of the earth.

"Rome is to Catholic Christendom what Washington is to the United States" (p. 170).

Rome was stolen from its owner, and "Catholic Christendom" became the receiver of the stolen goods, after having, in the person of her infallible Head, instigated to the theft. Was Washington stolen from Maryland, and did the United States become the receiver of the stolen goods, after having instigated to the theft?

"Therefore we protest against the occupation of Rome by foreign troops as a high-handed act of injustice, and a gross violation of the commandment which says, "Thou shalt not steal" (p. 170).

This is cool! The receiver of stolen goods calling the owner a thief for reclaiming them!

"Let the Popes leave Rome forever, and in five years grass will be growing in its streets" (pp. 171, 172).

Even if that were so, it would be an infinite gain, provided they left the *world* at the same time. But it isn't so. When, in the beginning of the fourteenth century, "St. Peter transferred his chair" to Avignon, and kept it there for seventy years, Rome survived the loss. For the last seven years of his life, the "Prisoner of the Vatican" *practically* left Rome, but grass *didn't* grow in its streets any more than when he literally left it for Gaeta in the earlier part of his pontificate; nor has "the city lost one-half of its population." On the contrary that population is believed to be increasing.

"Our present beloved Pontiff Pius IX., I need not inform you, is now treated with indignity in his own city" (p. 173).

Certainly you need not. We are all well aware that he is treated with the same "indignity" in Rome that

you are treated with in Baltimore—namely, not allowed to wield the civil sword, but left at perfect liberty to wield the spiritual.

“The Roman people, even had they so desired, had no right to transfer, by their suffrage, the Patrimony* of St. Peter to Victor Emmanuel. They could not give what did not belong to them” (p. 170).

“The Pontiffs have received their earthly dominion from man, and what man gives man may take away” (p. 175).

Put that and that together.

“The interests of Christianity demand that the Vicar of the Prince of peace should possess one spot of territory which would be held inviolable” (p. 168).

“For the last seven years the Pope has been deprived of his temporalities. This loss, however, does not bring a wrinkle on the fair brow of the Church, nor does it retard one inch her onward march” (p. 78).

That is to say, “the interests of Christianity demand” for the Church, that which will not advance “her onward march” one inch. In other words, the *whole* benefit, to the Church, of the Temporal Power, is an advance of less than one inch in her onward march; so that at the final consummation the Roman Church will be not more (say) than seven-eighths of an inch behind where she would have been if Victor Emmanuel had left her alone! Rather a small matter to whine about; especially in view of the old proverb, that “it’s of no use crying for spilt milk.”

“I envy neither the heart nor the head of those men who are now gloating, with fiendish joy, over the calamities of the Pope” (p. 174).

“A civil ruler dabbling in religion is as reprehensible as a clergyman dabbling in politics. Both render themselves odious as well as ridiculous” (p. 162).

* The Pope is all the time talking about the patrimony of S. Peter, but says nothing of his matrimony. Holy Scripture, on the other hand, speaks repeatedly of his matrimony, but says nothing of his patrimony, unless we may include under that designation his nets, his ship (which was a small fishing craft), and half a house; and these he forsook to follow Jesus. Silver and gold he had none.—*Afterpiece to the Comedy of Convocation.*

Our "joy" is that the Pope is relieved from the necessity of "dabbling in politics," and thereby rendering himself "odious" if not "ridiculous." Surely a joy like that cannot fairly be called "fiendish." His Spiritual Power is untouched, and if he thinks cursing "heretics" a part of it, he can curse to his heart's content; and if he is at a loss for material, the Council of Trent and the late Council of the Vatican can furnish him with a whole litany of curses. Here is a specimen. I take it from "The First Constitution of the Vatican Council on the Church of Christ," as published in the *Catholic Mirror*, Baltimore, August 13th, 1870, and vouched for by the Editor thus: "We publish to-day an *authorized* translation of the *Constitutio Dogmatica Prima de Ecclesia Christi*. The correctness of this document, which comes from an official source, may therefore be relied on":

"Therefore, if any one shall say that the Roman Pontiff has only the office of inspection or direction, and not full and supreme power of jurisdiction over the whole Church, not only in matters belonging to faith and morals, but also to those which regard the discipline and government of the Church spread throughout the whole world, or that he has only the principal share, but not the entire fulness of this supreme power; or that this power of his is not ordinary and immediate either over the Churches one and all, or over the Pastors and the faithful one and all; let him be anathema."

These curses move us not. The source they come from renders them harmless.

"There is no terror, Cassius, in your threats."

They are out of place when directed against us. Bestow them in another quarter.

"Go tell your slaves how *absolute* you are,
And make your bondmen tremble."

"Some time ago, my attention was called to a cer-

tain excommunication or 'curse,' then widely circulated by the press of North Carolina. The 'curse' is attributed to the Holy Father, and is fulminated against Victor Emmanuel. . . . I state here distinctly and positively that its author is not Pius IX., nor any other Roman Pontiff, nor any Catholic Priest or layman. It is to the Rev. Laurence Sterne, Minister of the Established Church of England, and to his romance of 'Tristram Shandy,' that the English-speaking world is indebted for this infamous compilation" (pp. 174, 175).

This is the curse that so moved Uncle Toby. "Our army," said he, "swore terribly in Flanders, but it was nothing to this." The Archbishop is very explicit in his denial. Sterne is equally explicit in his affirmation: It was "procured," he tells us, "out of the leger-book of the church of Rochester, writ by Ernulphus the bishop." He adds in a foot-note, in a subsequent edition: "As the genuineness of the consultation of the Sorbonne upon the question of baptism, was doubted by some and denied by others—'twas thought proper to print the original of this excommunication; for the copy of which Mr. Shandy returns thanks to the chapter-clerk of the dean and chapter of Rochester."

It is a very pretty quarrel as it stands; I leave it to the Archbishop and Mr. Shandy to settle it between them.

Non nostrum inter vos tantas componere lites.
Et vitula tu dignus, et hic, et quisquis amores
Aut metuet dulces, aut experietur amaros.
Claudite jam rivos, pueri: sat prata biberunt.

P. S.—Since the above was written, a work has come into my possession which enables me to settle the quarrel in favor of Mr. Shandy, and against the Archbishop, notwithstanding his bold denial. See Appendix B.

CHAPTER XIII.

THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

NEARLY all this chapter is employed by the Archbishop in proving what needs no proof, to wit, that intercessory prayer is availing, and that the dead in Christ pray for those still in the flesh. This is what all Christians admit. The whole controversy between us and Rome, on this point, is whether, as the Creed of Pope Pius teaches, "the saints, *reigning with Christ*, are to be venerated and *invoked*." Here is an implication and an assertion : 1, it is *implied* that there are saints now reigning with Christ ; and 2, it is *asserted* that these saints are to be invoked.

Now, with regard to the first, I suppose it will be admitted that if there are any saints now reigning with Christ, St. Paul must be one of them. Is St. Paul, then, reigning now with Christ? In other words, has he already got his crown? Let him speak for himself (2 Tim. 4 : 1, 8) : "Who shall *judge the quick and the dead* at his *appearing* and his *kingdom*. . . . Henceforth there is *laid up for me* a crown of righteousness, which the Lord, the righteous *judge*, shall give me *at that day* : and not to me only, but unto all them also that love his *appearing*." Words could not assert more plainly that the crown is to be given to all Christians at one and the same time, and that time the "day" of his "appearing," to "judge the quick and the dead." When, therefore, the Apostle elsewhere speaks of the departed as being with Christ, he means, not that they are in heaven reigning with Him, but that they are in paradise (that part of *hades* (St. Luke 16 : 23) where Abraham and Lazarus were) enjoying the manifestation of Christ's presence, "resting from their labors" (Rev.

14 : 13), and waiting for " the glory which shall be revealed " (Romans 8 : 18). So St. Paul says, and so says " the Prince of the Apostles " : " And when the chief Shepherd shall appear, ye shall receive a crown of glory that fadeth not away " (1 St. Peter 5 : 4). And so says our Lord Himself to His Apostles (St. Matt. 19 : 28), " In the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." And so say the early Fathers and the greater part of the later ones. I might bring citations from them in proof, but I prefer laying before the reader the declarations and admissions, on this point, of Roman theologians themselves : " It was a matter in controversy of old," says Franciscus Pegna, " whether the souls of the saints before the day of judgment did see God, and enjoy the divine vision : seeing many worthy men and famous, both for learning and holiness, did seem to hold, that they do not see nor enjoy it before the day of judgment, until receiving their bodies together with them they should enjoy divine blessedness. For Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus [the last named, in the first century ; the other three, in the second], Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Theodoret, Aretas, Œcumenius, Theophylact, and Euthymius are said to have been of this opinion : as Castrus and Medina, and Sotus do relate." *

* " Olim controversum fuit, num animæ Sanctorum usque ad diem judicii Deum viderent, et divina visione fruerentur : cum multi insignes viri et doctrina et sanctitate clari tenere viderentur, eas nec videre nec frui usque ad diem judicii ; donec receptis corporibus una cum illis divina beatitudine perfruantur. Nam Irenæus, Justinus Martyr, Tertullianus, Clemens Romanus ; Origenes, Ambrosius, Chrysostomus, Augustinus, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Theodoretus, Aretas, Œcumenius, Theophylactus, et Euthymius, hujus referuntur sententiæ : ut commemorant Castrus, et Medina, et Sotus." FRANC. PEGNA, in part. 2. *Directorii Inquisitor*. comment. 21. Quoted by Abp. Usher in his *Answer to a Jesuit*. See also Brogden's *Catholic Safeguards*, vol. 2, p. 203.

And “even Thomas Stapleton himself” says : “These so many ancient Fathers, Tertullian, Irenæus, Origen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Œcumenius, Theophylact, Ambrose, Clemens Romanus, and Bernard, *did not assent* unto this sentence (which now in the Council of Florence [A.D. 1439] was at length after much disputing defined as a doctrine of faith) that the souls of the righteous enjoy the sight of God before the day of judgment ; but did deliver the contrary sentence thereunto.” *

We have then (according to the testimony of three Roman writers, Castrus, Medina, and Sotus, certified to by another Roman writer, Pegna, and Stapleton, a famous English controversialist on the Roman side, agreeing with them) all the earlier Fathers that touch upon the subject, and the most weighty ones (Chrysostom, Ambrose, and Augustine) of the later, maintaining, in accordance with St. Peter and St. Paul, the teaching of our Lord Himself, that the saints do not reign with Him till after the Resurrection.

On the other hand, the Archbishop, if he were to set about it, could produce one clear and explicit assertion, from Dionysius of Alexandria, as reported by Eusebius (l. vi. c. 42), and two doubtful ones (one of St. Cyprian, Ep. 55, and the other of his correspondents, Ep. 31), that the *martyrs* (not the other saints) *reign at once with Christ*. This is absolutely all that I have been able to find, and I challenge the Archbishop to produce any more. Passages he will find, indeed, in Jerome, and Basil, and Ephrem, and Athanasius, and Epiphanius,

* “Tot illi et tam celebres antiqui patres, Tertullianus, Irenæus, Origenes, Chrysostomus, Theodoretus, Œcumenius, Theophylactus, Ambrosius, Clemens Romanus, D. Bernardus, huic sententiæ (quæ nunc in Concilio Florentino magna demum conquisitione facta ut dogma fidei definita est) quod justorum animæ ante diem judicii Dei visione fruuntur, non sunt assensi ; *sed sententiam contrariam tradiderunt.*”—STAPLETON. *Defens. Ecclesiast. Authorit. contra Whitaker.* lib. i, cap. 2.—Apud Usher.

and Gregory of Nazianzum, and so he will in Augustine and Chrysostom, which speak of the saints as in heaven (meaning thereby *paradise*, not the heaven of heavens), enjoying the company of the patriarchs, the presence of angels, and of Christ Himself ; but they do *not* speak of them as *reigning* with Christ before the Resurrection.

According to the Roman doctrine, the saints that are now *reigning in heaven* are to be called out of heaven at the last day, to be judged, and then sent back again ! *Credat Romanus, non Ego.*

The *foundation* of the Roman doctrine, that “ the saints *reigning together with Christ* are to be venerated and invoked,” being thus taken away, the superstructure would seem likely to go with it. The Archbishop, however, comes boldly to the rescue.

“ I might easily show,” he says, “ by voluminous quotations from ecclesiastical writers of the first ages of the Church, how conformable to the teaching of antiquity is the Catholic practice of invoking the intercession of the saints. But as you, dear reader, may not be disposed to attach adequate importance to the writings of the Fathers, I shall confine myself to the testimony of Holy Scripture” (pp. 177, 178).

“ But as you, dear reader, may not be” as well aware of Roman tactics as I am, let me just say to you, don’t be misled by the Archbishop’s boast of what he “ might easily” do, and by the reason he gives why he doesn’t do it. Before we get through with his “ little volume,” we shall find that he has given in the other chapters no less than fifty-seven quotations (or what purport to be quotations) from the Fathers, without troubling himself about whether or not you will be “ disposed to attach adequate importance” to them ; and he would give them here *if he could*. I distinctly challenge him to produce, not “ voluminous quotations,” but *one* quotation, ever so brief, sanctioning or recognizing any “ practice of invoking the intercession of the saints,”

except among heretics, from any *genuine* ecclesiastical writing "of the first ages of the Church," meaning thereby the first three centuries.

I come now to the Archbishop's "testimony of Holy Scripture." He first quotes, and comments on, Genesis 48 : 16 (Jacob's blessing of the sons of Joseph), thus : "'May the angel that delivereth me from all evils, bless these boys.' Here we see a holy Patriarch . . . asking the angel in heaven to obtain a blessing for his grandchildren" (p. 179).

"Here we see a holy" Archbishop quoting half the blessing, and omitting the other half, because to have quoted it would have shown the identity of the angel with the uncreated God. I will supply the omission, with the help of the Douay Bible in my possession—a pocket edition, published at Belfast, Ireland, and certified to and sanctioned by "Cornelius Denvir, D.D., R. C. Bishop of Down and Connor," July 24th, 1839. In this edition the blessing (Gen. 48 : 15, 16) reads : "God, in whose sight my fathers Abraham and Isaac walked, God that feedeth me from my youth until this day ; The angel that delivereth me from all evils, bless these boys," etc. Commenting on this, St. Athanasius says (*Orat. IV. contr. Arian.* apud Usher), "He did not couple one of the created and natural angels with God that did create them ; nor omitting God that fed him [the very thing the Archbishop has here done], did desire a blessing for his grandsons from an angel ; but saying, 'that delivereth me from all evils,' he did show that it was not any of the created angels, but the Word of God (that is to say, the Son) whom he coupled with the Father and prayed unto." But not satisfied with mutilating the quotation, the Archbishop must needs, in commenting upon it, change *in a vital part* what he does quote. Jacob does *not* ask the angel to "*obtain*" a blessing ; he asks him to *bestow* one : which, of itself

(as the Archbishop confesses by changing it), shows that it was not a created angel.

His next proof is not from Holy Scripture, but from the Apocrypha, which as I have already shown from St. Jerome (Chapter viii.), is of no *authority*.

The next two proofs, and the only remaining ones, that he brings are St. Luke 15 : 10, and 1 Cor. 4 : 8 ; but all they show is that angels know, more or less, what is going on here. But that does not prove that they are to be "invoked ;" for that is just what is reprobated by the Apostle in Colossians 2 : 18, which, in the Archbishop's Version, is, as I have already remarked, thus *lucidly* translated : " Let no man seduce you, willing in humility and religion of angels," etc., but which the non-Roman reader would probably prefer in the transparent English, and at the same time accurate translation, of our Version : " Let no man beguile you of your reward in a voluntary humility (*volens videri humilis affectans humilitatem*, says St. Augustine, *Epist.* cxlix., sect. 27 ; wishing to seem humble, affecting humility) and worshipping (*θρησκεία*, *cultura*, Aug.) of angels, intruding into those things which he hath not seen, vainly puffed up by his fleshly mind, and not holding the Head," etc.

This " worshipping of angels " continued among the heretics in Colosse, and Laodicea, and other parts of Phrygia, three or four hundred years ; so that the Council of Laodicea, in the fourth century, whose Canons were afterwards received into the code of the universal Church, enacted among its sixty canons the following :

" XXXV. Christians must not leave the Church of God, and go and invoke angels, or make assemblies, which things are forbidden. If then any one is discovered giving himself to this hidden idolatry, let him be anathema, for he has forsaken our Lord Jesus

Christ [“not holding the Head”], the Son of God, and gone over to idolatry.”

From this, we see that, in the fourth century, there was no invoking of angels in “the Church of God;” for men had to “leave the Church,” and go elsewhere, to invoke them.

What a sore point this was with the Roman Canonists, is evident from the fact that Carranza, Sagittarius, and Joverius (Usher, apud Brogden, vol. ii., p. 235), changed *angelos*, angels, into *angulos*, corners, and put *ad* before it, so as to make it read *invoke at corners*; forgetting that the Canon was originally in Greek, and that the Greek word for *corner* (γωνία) has no resemblance to the Greek word for angel. But the very fact that they changed the text of the Latin translation of the Canon shows that they felt that, as it stood, it condemned them.

Theodoret, in the fifth century, in his commentary on the passage from Colossians, as quoted by Usher, says they counselled invoking angels, “pretending humility, and saying that the God of all things was invisible, and inaccessible, and incomprehensible; and that it was fit we should procure God’s favor by the means of angels;” the very reason given by Roman theologians. Alexander of Hales says, “A sinner who hath offended God, because he dareth not to come unto him in his own person, may have recourse unto the saints, by imploring their patronage.” Gabriel Biel says, “A sinner who has offended God, as it were not daring for the dross of his sin to appear in his proper person, before the most high and dreadful Majesty, should have recourse unto the saints.” And Salmeron the Jesuit says, in so many words, “The praying of God by the invocation of saints doth argue greater humility.” * All in the teeth of the exhortation

* See the original Latin of these three quotations in Usher, apud Brogden, vol. 2. p. 224.

(Col. 2 : 18) above cited ; in the teeth of the exhortation (Heb. 4 : 16), " Let us therefore come boldly unto the throne of grace ;" in the teeth of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom. For, says the former, writing against Parmenian the Donatist, and referring to 1 St. John 2 : 1, " If he had said thus : I have written this unto you, that you sin not, and if any man sin, you have me a mediator with the Father, I make intercession for your sins (as Parmenian in one place doth make the bishop a mediator betwixt the people and God), what good and faithful Christian would endure him ? Who would look upon him as the apostle of Christ, and not as Antichrist rather ?" (lib. ii. c. 8). And says St. Chrysostom, " We do not therefore so pacify him when we entreat him by others, as when we do it by our own selves. For by reason that he loveth our friendship, and doth all things that we may put our confidence in him, when he beholdeth us to do this by ourselves, then doth he most yield unto our suits. Thus did he deal with the woman of Canaan : when Peter and James came for her, he did not yield ; but when she herself did remain, he presently gave that which was desired."—*In Psalm IV.* apud Usher. And again : " Mark the philosophy of the woman. She entreateth not James, she beseecheth not John, neither doth she come to Peter, but she brake through the whole company of them, saying : I have no need of a mediator, but taking repentance with me for a spokesman, I come to the fountain itself. For this cause did he descend, for this cause did he take flesh, that I might have the boldness to speak unto him. . . . I have no need of a mediator [between me and Thee, for Thou Thyself art *the* Mediator] : have thou mercy upon me."—*Serm. in dimission. Chananææ* ; apud Usher. St. Chrysostom is full of this teaching. Archbishop Usher gives no less than sixteen other quotations from him, all to the same effect. The illustration from the woman of Canaan

seems to have been a favorite one with him, for he brings it in, in no less than five out of the eighteen passages.

By this time, the reader is doubtless prepared to estimate at its true value, or want of value, the Archbishop's boast about the "voluminous quotations" he could (but, very prudently, doesn't) give.

Passing over four of the Archbishop's pages (181-184) devoted to proving (what no Christian doubts) the value of intercessory prayer, offered by the faithful, whether on earth or in paradise, I come to another quotation from Scripture (Rev. 5 : 8). But first let me notice a remark of his on his previous quotations—the ones I have already considered :

"The examples I have quoted," he says, "refer, it is true, to the angels. But our Lord declares (St. Mat. 22 : 30) that the saints in heaven shall be like the angelic spirits," etc. (p. 180).

True ; but they are not yet like them, and will not be till the Resurrection ; for "our Lord declares," in the parallel passage (St. Luke 20 : 36), "they are equal unto the angels ; and are the children of God, *being the children of the resurrection.*" In *knowledge*, therefore (which is the point here at issue), the saints are not yet equal to the angels.

To come now to the additional quotations from Scripture. There are but two of them ; both on page 185. The one from Zachariah is disposed of by filling up the gap indicated by the *dots* in the closing sentence : "And the Lord answered the angel *that talked with me* * good words, comfortable words." The angel as the whole context, and especially the nineteenth verse, shows, was on earth, talking with the prophet.

The other passage is as little to the point : "St.

* The Douay Version has : "that spoke *in* me ;" but in the 19th verse (in the Hebrew, ch. 2, vs. 2), it translates the same Hebrew words "that spoke *to* me."

John, in his Revelation," says the Archbishop, "describes the saints before the throne of God praying for their earthly brethren : ' The four and twenty ancients (elders) (Rev. 5 : 8) fell down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of the saints.' "

St. John "describes" (*not* "the saints," but) "the four and twenty elders"—official functionaries ; and he describes them *not* as "praying," but as offering incense. True, "the odors *are* the prayers of saints ;" and so, in the twentieth verse of the first chapter of this same book of Revelation, "the seven candlesticks *are* the seven churches." But as the candlesticks are *not transubstantiated* into churches, so neither are the odors *transubstantiated* into prayers. The candlesticks *symbolize* the churches ; the odors *symbolize* the prayers. The elders are doing in the heavenly temple what Zacharias was doing (St. Luke 1 : 9, 10) in the earthly. He was offering incense in the holy place (not the holy of holies, for into that went only the high priest), and "the whole multitude of the people were praying without." The "elders," in the heavenly temple, are offering incense in the holy place (not in the Holy of Holies ; into that only the Great High Priest is entered), and "the whole multitude" of the faithful, on earth and in paradise, "are praying without." And as the people did not invoke Zacharias, nor could he have heard them, though invoked, so neither do the faithful on earth (if well instructed) and in paradise invoke the elders, nor can the elders, so far as we are informed or have reason to believe, hear them, though invoked.

So much for the Archbishop's Scripture testimony. Now for his argument from analogy.

"If my brother leaves me to cross the seas, I believe that he continues to pray for me. And when he crosses the narrow sea of death, and lands on the shores

of eternity, why should he not pray for me still?" (p. 186).

He *does* "pray for me still." But then, as, when he "leaves me to cross the seas," and is in mid-ocean or has reached his port, I do not, unless I am a fool, drop down on my marrow-bones and invoke him, because I know he cannot hear me, any more than I can hear him; so when he "crosses the narrow sea of death," I do not kneel down and invoke him, because I know that I cannot hear him, and I have no reason to believe that he can hear me. Think of what is involved in the worship of the Virgin, for instance. According to the Archbishop (p. 26), her worshippers number "two hundred and twenty-five millions." *Catholics* he calls them. But that is a misnomer. No one that worships a created being—I speak, of course, of religious worship—can be a Catholic. Of these two hundred and twenty-five millions, at least two hundred and twenty-five thousand—that is, only one in a thousand—must be invoking her at any given moment, and she must be supposed to hear them all. Surely, there is no element of probability in the supposition. Think of her listening every Sunday to five millions of worshippers in the United States alone! Think of it! Hold to it, then—if you can! For my part, I say, with Tertullian, "These things I may not pray for from any other but from Him of whom I *know* I shall obtain them;" *hæc ab alio orare non possum, quam a quo scio me consecuturum* (*Apolog.* c. 30).

Having thus met every argument of the Archbishop in this chapter *squarely*, I come now to ask of him a reason for a most extraordinary omission of his. How is it, Most Reverend Sir, that, knowing, as you do, the prominence given to the Worship of the Virgin in your Churches, and that there are three kinds of religious worship recognized by your standard writers, namely, *dulia*, to the saints, *latria* to God, and (betwixt the

two) *hyperdulia*, to the Virgin, there is not, throughout the 433 pages of your book, so much as an allusion to any worship of the Virgin as distinguished from the other saints, nor is she once mentioned, either by name or by title, as an object of worship at all? Is it because you are *afraid*, in these United States and this Nineteenth Century, to hold up plainly before the American People that which, nevertheless, you are trying to entice them into, and make them part and parcel of? If so, the fear does credit to your perspicacity, if not to your ingenuousness. Let me supply the omission, in part; in very small part: to do it fully would require a volume, and one at least five times as large as this. I confine myself, therefore, to a few instances, in part, of the theory, and in part, of the practice; and I take them (except where otherwise specified) from Abp. Usher's *Answer to a Jesuit*, as reprinted in Brogden's *Catholic Safeguards*, London, John Murray, 1851; vol. ii., pp. 239-257; where may be found a great many more, all in the original Latin, as well as in English:

"Because she is the mother of the Son of God who doth produce the Holy Ghost; therefore all the gifts, virtues, and graces of the Holy Ghost are by her hands administered to whom she pleaseth, when she pleaseth, how she pleaseth, and as much as she pleaseth."—*Et quia talis est mater filii Dei qui producit Spiritum sanctum; ideo omnia dona, virtutes et gratiæ ipsius Spiritus sancti quibus vult, quando vult, quomodo vult, et quantum vult, per manus ipsius administrantur.* Bernardin, Senens. serm. 61, artic. 1, c. 8."—(Brogden, vol. ii., p 243).

"No grace comes down to us from heaven that is not of her dispensing."—*Nulla gratia de cœlo nisi ea dispensante ad nos descendit.*—*Id. ibid. artic. 3, c. 3.*

"Take away the patronage of the Virgin, you stop as it were the sinner's breath, that he is not able to live any longer."—*Quasi sublato Virginis patrocinio, per-*

inde atque habitu intercluso, peccator vivere diutius non possit.—Blas. Viegas in *Apocalyps.* cap. 12, comment. 2, sect. 2, num. 6.

“All things are subject to the command of the Virgin,* even God Himself.”—Imperio Virginis omnia famulantur, et Deus.—Bernardin. Senens. serm. 61, artic. 1. cap. 6 (Brogden, vol. ii., p. 245).

In the Psalter of Cardinal Bonaventure the Psalms are blasphemously travestied by changing LORD into Lady, thus :

“Have mercy upon me, O Lady, have mercy upon me.”—Miserere mei Domina, miserere mei.—Psalm 56.

“Let Mary arise ; and let her enemies be scattered.”—Exurgat Maria, et dissipentur inimici ejus.—Psalm 67.

“O sing unto our Lady a new song : for she hath done marvellous things.”—Cantate Dominae nostræ canticum novum : quia mirabilia fecit.—Psalm 97.

“In thee, O Lady, have I put my trust ; let me never be confounded.”—In te Domina speravi, non confundar in æternum.—Ps. 30.

“Let everything that hath breath praise our Lady.” Omnis spiritus laudet Dominam nostram—Psalm 150 (Brogden, vol. ii., pp. 252–255).

The following is from Bp. Bull’s Sermons : Sermon IV., reprinted in Brogden, vol. ii. pp. 258–279. It will be found on page 274 :

“We should tremble every joint of us, to offer any such recommendation as this to the Virgin Mary. Hear, if you can without horror, a prayer of theirs to her. It is this :

“O my Lady, holy Mary, I recommend myself into thy blessed trust, and singular custody, and into the bosom of thy mercy this night and evermore, and

* The Vulgate Latin and the Douay English translation of Gen. 3 : 15 make the devil subject to her : “*She* shall crush thy head.” The pronoun in the Hebrew is masculine, and can refer only to the “Seed.”

in the hour of my death, as also my soul and my body ; and I yield unto thee all my hope and consolation, all my distress and misery, my life and the end thereof, that by thy most holy intercession, and by thy merits, all my works may be directed and disposed according to thine and thy Son's will. Amen.' What fuller expressions can we use to declare our absolute affiance, trust, and dependence on the Eternal Son of God himself, than they here use in this recommendation to the Virgin? . . . And yet this recommendation is to be seen, in a 'Manual of Prayers and Litanies,' printed at Antwerp, no longer ago than 1671, and that *permissu superiorum*, in the evening prayers for Friday. A book it is to my knowledge commonly to be found in the hands of our English papists ; for I had it from a near relation of mine (who had been perverted by the emissaries of Rome ; but is returned again to the Communion of the Church of England), who assured me that she used it herself by the direction of her Confessor, in her private devotions."

Of the nature of this worship of the Virgin I shall have something to say in the next chapter, where it will come in more conveniently in connection with image-worship.

A few more extracts and I close this chapter. I take them from a dingy little volume in coarse brown-paper covers, which I came across at a second-hand book-seller's in Baltimore, some ten years ago. It is in French, and bears the imprint, "Avignon, Seguîn Aîné, Imprimeur-Libraire." It is without date, but, judging from the orthography, comes within the last half century. The title, translated into English, reads : "The Month of Mary, or the Month of May, consecrated to Mary, by means of different flowers of virtue which all can practise in the Churches, or in private houses. By the Rev. Father Alphonse Muzzarelli, of

the Company of Jesus. *Flores mei fructus honoris et honestatis.* Ecclus. xxiv. 23."

Beneath this Latin motto is seen in staring block-letter capitals, twice as large as the principal letters of the title, the words,

V I V E
M A R I E :

that is to say, "Long live Mary!" On pages 14-16 are "Twelve Acts of Virtues, to be practised during the Month." The *sixth* reads: "Every day, before entering on your studies or work, invoke the aid of Mary, saying on your knees the *Hail Mary*." On the next three pages are thirty-one "Other Acts of Virtues." The *second* reads: "Cause to be said, or at least hear, an extra Mass for the soul in Purgatory that in this world best served Mary;" the *eighth*: "Say three *De Profundis* for the soul in Purgatory that has best served Mary." What is the service of Mary good for, if it can't keep a soul out of Purgatory? The *tenth* reads: "To please Mary, fulfil exactly all your duties." The *thirteenth*: "At the beginning of the day, offer to Mary your senses, your body, and all your actions." The *twenty-third*: "Mortify your will three times in honor of Mary." The *twenty-sixth*: "Pray with fervor to Mary for those who are in mortal sin." The *thirty-first*: "Ask pardon of Mary for what you have neglected to do during the month."

Passing to the body of the work: the portion for each day consists of a Meditation, an Example or Edifying (?) Narrative, a Practice, and an Aspiration, or Ejaculatory Prayer. The Examples "are taken," as we are informed in the introductory Advertisement, "from the pious work of Father Auriemma, entitled *Mutual Affections of Mary and of her Servants*." "This author," it adds, "has extracted them for the

most part from the annual letters of the Company of Jesus"—that is, the Jesuits.

In the Example for the Third Day (*Auriem. t. 2, p. 57*) we are told that Mary boxed the ears of a Servant of hers for writing to his *mistress* with a pen that had been dedicated to the Virgin; and that his cheek was black and blue from the blow for several days after.

In the Example for the Twentieth Day (*Auriem. t. 2, p. 317*) we are told that a man, who "to avarice added many other vices, but had, nevertheless, devotion to Mary, and recited the rosary," being on his death-bed, "feared much for his salvation; whereupon the Mother of pity appeared to him and ordered the archangel St. Michael to put in one scale of the balance the good works which he had done in her honor, and in the other the sins he had confessed of his past bad life. The comparison was to his advantage, the devils fled, and Mary conducted him to paradise." The Ejaculatory Prayer with which it winds up reads: "Jesus, Mary, Joseph, I give you my heart and my soul."

But the most *astounding* Example is that for the Ninth Day. I give it in full:

"One of the most intimate companions of St. Francis, brother Leon, had the following vision (*Auriem. t. 2, p. 289*): He saw a great plain, on which the General Judgment was to take place. A great number were awaiting sentence; the trumpets were calling the dead to judgment. Two great ladders were let down from heaven, one white, the other red, at the top of which latter was Jesus Christ. St. Francis was near; he was calling his brethren mingled among the rest in the plain, and encouraging them to mount this ladder. They would obey, but would fall after mounting, one three rounds, another four, another ten. Then Francis in despair exhorted them to go to the white ladder, on which Mary was leaning. They did so; Mary held out her hand to them, and they easily mounted to heaven. We

should be very unfortunate if we had not this powerful Mother to aid those who are mounting to heaven by the ladder of justice alone."

The Ejaculatory Prayer which follows this, runs thus: "*In die judicii, libera me, Domina.* Au jour du jugement, delivrez-moi, MARIE." That is, "In the day of judgment, deliver me, MARY." Or, as it is in the Latin, "Deliver me, LADY."

Comment is superfluous.

But, says the Bishop of Aire, as quoted by Faber, *Difficulties of Romanism*, chap. xv.), "If any of our doctors, pushed on by a blind zeal, has gone so far as to ascribe to the saints a degree of power and efficacy which belongs only to Jesus Christ; know that we vindicate not his excess: and it were unjust to make the catholic body in general responsible for certain exaggerations in particular."

I answer: It is not *we* that make Rome responsible for the extravagances of individuals. So long as she puts Pascal, and Quesnel, in the *Index*, and does *not* put Auriemma, and Viegas, and Bernardinus Senensis, in it—so long as she anathematizes Padre Vigil for denying the Immaculate Conception, and canonizes Cardinal Bonaventure with his blasphemous Psalter of our Lady—it is she that makes herself responsible for any and all "exaggerations" that put the creature on a level with the Creator. And we shall hold her to that responsibility.

CHAPTER XIV.

SACRED IMAGES.

"THE veneration of the images of Christ and His saints is a cherished devotion in the Catholic Church, and this practice will be vindicated in the following lines:

“ It is true, indeed, that the making of holy images was not so general among the Jews as it is among us, because the Hebrews themselves were prone to idolatry, and because they were surrounded by idolatrous people who might misconstrue the purpose for which the images were intended. For the same prudential reasons the primitive Christians were very cautious in making images, and very circumspect in exposing them to the gaze of the heathen among whom they lived, lest Christian images should be confounded with Pagan idols” (p. 189).

“ Very cautious,” and “ very circumspect,” indeed ! So cautious, and so circumspect, that, for the first four hundred years, they actually had no images for religious worship, such as the Roman Church now pays to them, in any congregation of the Catholic Church. I distinctly challenge the Archbishop to produce one instance—only one ; but it must be from a genuine writing ; not from one of those spurious ones that the Roman controversialists are so fond of quoting : and it must be a worship such (in its essence, not necessarily in its accessories) as is now taught and practised in the Roman Church. What, then, is that worship ? The *second* Council of Nice (A.D. 787), received as a General Council by the Roman Church, but rejected by the Greek and the Anglican, is the earliest that sanctioned the worship of images—that is to say, “ to pay these images salutation and respectful honor : not indeed that true worship, which is according to our faith, which only befits the divine nature, . . . but to offer incense and lights to their honor.” The Council of Trent decrees that “ due honor and veneration are to be given them.” The Catechism of the Council of Trent (First Amer. Ed., Balt., John Murphy, p. 334) declares “ the lawfulness of the use of images in churches, and of paying them religious respect (*honorem et cultum*), when this respect is referred to their

prototypes.” This last clearly sanctions the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas (though a Saint of the Roman Calendar needs no such sanction of his teaching) and of Azorius the Jesuit, the former of whom says, “The same reverence is to be given unto the image of Christ and to Christ himself: and by consequence, seeing Christ is adored with the adoration of *latria* (the highest kind of worship), his image is to be adored with the adoration of *latria* also.” Sic sequitur quod eadem reverentia exhibeatur imagini Christi et ipsi Christo. Cum ergo Christus adoretur adoratione latriæ, consequens est, quod ejus imago sit adoratione latriæ adoranda. — *Summ.* part 3, q. 25, art. 3. And Azorius says, “It is the constant judgment of theologians that the image is to be honored and worshipped with the same honor and worship wherewith that is worshipped whereof it is an image.” Constans est Theologorum sententia, imaginem eodem honore et cultu honorari et coli, quo colitur id cujus est imago. — Jo. Azor. *Institut. Moral.* t. i. l. 9, c. 6 (Usher ap. Brogden, vol. ii. p. 329).

Such is the image-worship taught and practised in the Roman Church. The simple fact that the Catholic Church of the first four centuries knew no such teaching or practice, and that the Catholic Church of the next four testifies against it, is enough to condemn it.

But, says the Archbishop, “the catacombs of Rome . . . attest the practice of the early Christian Church. You could see there painted on the walls, or on vases of glass, the Dove, the emblem of the Holy Ghost; Christ carrying His Cross, or bearing on his shoulders the lost sheep. You could also meet with the Lamb, and an anchor, and a ship, appropriate types of our Lord, of hope, and of the Church” (pp. 189, 190).

Certainly you could; and you can see them now, in our Churches, on our stained-glass windows, and no

one ever confounds them with images set up to be worshipped. No one bows down to them, or burns incense to them. They are either historical pictures, useful for instruction, or symbols. Now a symbol and an image are entirely distinct from each other. An eye is a *symbol* of knowledge ; a triangle is a *symbol* of the Trinity ; a dove is a *symbol* of the Holy Ghost. In like manner, the cross is a *symbol* of the crucifixion ; but the crucifix is an *image* of it : and, as the Archbishop well knows, you find no crucifix in the catacombs.

“ The first crusade against images was waged in the eighth century by Leo the Isaurian, Emperor of Constantinople ” (p. 190).

A *slight* mistake of the Archbishop, in the name of the monarch, and in the chronology. It was good king Hezekiah, fifteen hundred years before Leo, who waged the first crusade against images. “ He destroyed the high places,” says the Douay Bible (4 Kings (our 2 Kings) 18 : 4) “ and broke the statues in pieces, and cut down the groves, and broke the brazen serpent, which Moses had made : for till that time the children of Israel burnt incense to it : and he called its name Nohestan [Nehushtan, *brass image* ; as if he had said, as he smashed it, “ Old Brass ! ”]. “ This barbaric warfare against religious memorials was,” in the opinion of the Archbishop, “ not only a grievous sacrilege, but an outrage against the fine arts ” (p. 191). Yet the Douay Bible, in continuation of the narrative, commends Hezekiah for that “ he stuck to the Lord, and departed not from his steps, but kept his commandments, which the Lord commanded Moses.”

Now for what reason was it that Hezekiah thus broke in pieces an image that had been made by the express command of God Himself ; and not only broke it in pieces, but applied to it an opprobrious epithet ? It was because “ the children of Israel burnt incense to it ” — the very thing which (as we have seen above, p.

205) the Archbishop's own Council (or rather, his Church's, for he seems to be afraid * of it) commanded to be done.

"Every Catholic child clearly comprehends the essential difference which exists between a Pagan idol and a Christian image" (p. 192).

If so, then "every Catholic child" has a clearer comprehension than the Archbishop; for he says in the next breath, "The Pagans looked upon an idol as a god endowed with intelligence, and the other attributes of the Deity. They were therefore idolators, or *image-worshippers*. Catholic Christians know that a holy image has no intelligence or power to hear and help them." The Archbishop slanders "the Pagans;" not intentionally, of course, but ignorantly, for lack of the clear comprehension that the "Catholic child" has. His own favorite Protestant authority, the "great Leibnitz," as he calls him in the next paragraph, where he quotes him at length, could have taught him better; for he says, as there quoted, "Certainly no sane man [and therefore no sane pagan, for the pagan is a man] thinks, under such circumstances, of praying in this wise: 'Give me, O image, what I ask; to thee, O marble or wood, I give thanks;' but 'Thee, O Lord, I adore;'" or, as the pagan would put it, Thee, O Jupiter, I adore. The *sole* difference between a Pagan image and a Christian image is, that the one is intended to represent a Pagan god or demigod, the other Jesus Christ (very God of very God), or the Virgin, or one of the Saints. The image of Christ is therefore in the same category with the golden calf, which was intended to represent not many *gods*, as it

* And yet he is under solemn vow to adhere to it; for the Creed of Pope Pius IV. which was imposed in 1564 upon all the beneficed Clergy of the Roman Church says, "I likewise undoubtedly receive and profess all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred Canons and General Councils."

is wrongly translated (Exod. 32 : 4), but the one God, as it is elsewhere rightly translated (Neh. [2 Esdr.] 9 : 18). It is true the *verb* is plural in the former, and singular in the latter ; but this only shows that a noun in the “plural of majesty” may take either a singular or a plural verb ; which is further proved (if further proof be wanting) by comparing the Hebrew of 2 Samuel [Kings] 7 : 23 with 1 Chron. [Paralip.] 17 : 21. When Moses came down from the Mount he found the Israelites worshipping not other gods than Jehovah, but Jehovah Himself, by means of an image ; in violation not of the first but of the second * commandment ; and therefore it was that Moses burnt the calf in the fire, and ground it to powder. And therefore it is that the Fathers of the first six centuries denounce image-worship. And they know nothing of the modern distinction which allows the worship of images of Christ, but not of images of God. They reject *all* image-worship.

Origen says : “ It is a thing impossible that one should know God, and pray to images.” *Οὐ μὲν δυνατόν ἐστὶ καὶ γινώσκειν τὸν θεὸν, καὶ τοῖς ἀγάλμασιν εὐχέσθαι.*—*Contr. Cels.* lib. vii. p. 386.

Lactantius : “ Wherefore there is no doubt that where there is an image, there is no religion.” *Quare non est dubium, quin religio nulla sit, ubicunque simulacrum est.*—*Div. Inst.* l. ii. c. 18.

Ambrose : “ The Church knows no empty forms and figures of images.” *Ecclesia inanes ideas et vanas nescit simulacrorum figuras.*—*De Fug. Sæc.* c. 5.

Augustine : “ For images are of more avail to bow down the unhappy mind (in that they have mouth, have eyes, have ears, have nostrils, have hands, have feet) than they have to correct it in that they speak

* This shows that the two commandments are distinct, and that therefore the joining of the two together as is done by the Douay, following a few inferior manuscripts, is wrong.

not, see not, hear not, smell not, handle not, walk not." Plus enim valent simulacra ad curvandam infelicem animam, quod os habent, oculos habent, aures habent, nares habent, manus habent, pedes habent; quam ad corrigendam, quod non loquentur, non videbunt, non audient, non odorabunt, non contrectabunt, non ambulabunt.—In Psal. 113 : 6.

Jerome: "We worship one only image, Jesus Christ, who is the image of God the Father." Nos unam tantum veneramur imaginem, Jesum nempe Christum, qui est imago Dei Patris.—In 1 *Joan.* 5 : 10. Remarking upon which Erasmus (as quoted by Bishop Andrewes, ap. Brogden, vol. ii., p. 359), says that "till Jerome was dead (A.D. 420) there was no image received."—Erasm., *Censura Catech.* 6, et in *Præfat. in Hieron.*

One more instance must suffice: Serenus, Bishop of Marseilles, having broken down the images in his Church because he found the people worshipping them, Pope Gregory the Great wrote to him: "We commended you that you had that zeal, that nothing made with hands should be worshipped: but yet we judge that you should not have broken those images. For painting is therefore used in Churches, that they who are unlearned may yet by sight read those things upon the walls, which they cannot read in books." Et quidem zelum vos, ne quid manufactum adorari possit habuisse laudavimus: sed frangere easdem imagines non debuiss. judicamus, etc.—*Registr.* lib. vii. epist. 109; etiam lib. ix. ep. ix. ap. Brog. ii. 338.

This was at the beginning of the seventh century. By this time images and paintings had been introduced for purposes of instruction; but not till nearly two hundred years after, in the second Council of Nice, A.D. 787, was the worship of them sanctioned. And this Council was rejected by the Council of Frankfort (A.D. 794), composed of three hundred bishops from

Gaul, Aquitaine, Germany, and Italy ; by the Council of Constantinople (A.D. 815) ; and by the Council of Paris (A.D. 824).

Tanta molis erat Romanum condere cultum.

Image-worship is a superstition of the heart, not of the head ; hence its danger. As Leibnitz well says, “ No sane man thinks ”—*i.e.*, holds as the deliberate conclusion of his intellect—that the image hears him ; but many a sane man—as men count sanity—imagines it for the moment : for, says St. Augustine, “ Who worships or prays, *looking upon an image*, and does not become so affected as to imagine he is heard by it, as to hope that what he longs for will be granted him by it ? ” *Quis autem adorat vel orat, intuens simulacrum, qui non sic afficitur, ut ab eo se exaudiri putet, ab eo sibi præstari quod desiderat speret ? — In Psal. cxiii. sec. 5.* And this of St. Augustine’s I will match against the rest of the long quotation from Leibnitz. St. Augustine knew whereof he affirmed, for he had been a pagan idolator himself. Indeed, most of the utterances I have cited from him and from the other Fathers—and I might have cited ten times as many—on this point, were called forth by the image-worship of the pagans. And this, of itself proves that image-worship was not then practised in the Catholic Church. For had it been, these Fathers would not have dared to use such language : for their adversaries would have retorted it upon them with terrible effect ; would have retorted on them St. Paul’s language (Rom. 2 : 21) or its equivalent : “ Thou therefore which teachest another, teachest thou not thyself ? . . . thou that abhorrest idols, dost thou commit sacrilege [literally, rob temples] ? ” Which, says Prof. Ornsby (of the “ Catholic University of Ireland ”) in his Note on the passage, “ refers, according to St. Chrys., to the Jews robbing pagan temples, though forbidden by the Mosaic law to

possess idols (Deut. 7:25), or the gold and silver of which they were made." Verily, had the Christians of those days worshipped images (which the Archbishop, in the passage I quoted from him at the beginning of this chapter, admits they were "*very cautious*" about), the name of God *would* have been "blasphemed among the Gentiles" (Rom. 2:24) through them, as it is blasphemed through Roman image-worship now in heathen lands. I say *image-worship*; for such it is admitted, nay, boldly maintained, to be, by those standard writers, Aquinas and Azorius, from whom I have quoted, and many others (*e.g.*, Boverius, Cardinal Cajetan, Guil. Lyndewode, Jac. Nanclantus, Pet. de Cabrera, Jac. de Graffiis) from whom I might quote, for I have passages of theirs now lying before me, which are none the worse for being vouched for by Archbishop Usher, a Primate who is not in the habit of drawing on fictitious funds, and whose drafts, therefore, are not dishonored. Against the consentient testimony of these theologians and canonized saints, and against the further testimony involved in the notorious preference of the common people for some one particular image of the Virgin over any and all other images of her, because they think their prayers before *it* are more likely to be answered, it is idle for the Archbishop to attempt to tone down the doctrine and the practice. Worse than idle is it for him to insult the intelligence of the humblest of his non-Roman readers by paralleling the uncovering of the heads of the spectators at the unveiling of the statue of Henry Clay in Richmond with the prostrations and incense-burnings before the images of the Virgin and the saints in the Roman Churches. He knows, and they know, and every *Catholic* child, and I think I may say every Roman child, "clearly comprehends" that the one is religious worship, and the other isn't; and that the two are heaven-wide from each other. Did he ever hear of any

one burning incense to "the statues of illustrious men" in "Westminster Abbey," or to "the likenesses of George Washington, of Patrick Henry, of Chief Justice Taney"?

It is noteworthy that the Archbishop does not cite a single passage of Scripture in proof of image-worship.* He cites the command to make the brazen serpent; but he is well aware that it was for healing, not for worship, and that when it was perverted to this latter use, Hezekiah destroyed it. He cites also the command to make the cherubim, and the account (3 (our) 1 Kings 6) of the carvings of cherubims and other figures in Solomon's Temple. But these, with the exception of the cherubim, are such as we have in our Churches; and the cherubim were not for worship, while the images in the Roman Churches are; for, says Cardinal Cajetan, speaking of the representations of Christ, and of angels, and of saints, "they are not only painted that they may be shown as the Cherubims were of old in the Temple, *but that they may be adored, as the frequent use of the Church doth testify.* Non solum pinguntur, ut ostendantur, sicut Cherubim olim in templo, sed ut adorentur: ut frequens usus Ecclesiæ testatur.—In 3 part, *Thomæ*, quæst. 25, art. 3." (Usher, ap. Brogden). The Archbishop, however, tries to convey a contrary impression, by introducing (p. 195) a dialogue between "an English Parson" and "a Catholic friend": "Tom, don't you pray to images?" "We pray before them," replied Tom; "but we have no intention of praying to them." "Who cares for your intention," retorted the Parson. "Don't you pray at night?" observed Tom. "Yes," said the Parson; "I pray at

* Not even Heb. 11: 21; doubtless because he has at last found out that "worshipped the top of his rod," which is the rendering even of the edition of Lucas Brothers, sanctioned by Abp. Whitefield, is a falsification of the Greek, which reads, "worshipped *upon* (ἐπι) the top of his rod;" and cannot possibly mean "worshipped the top of his rod."

my bed.' ' " Yes ; you pray to the bedpost." " Oh, no !" said the reverend gentleman ; " I have no intention of doing that." " Who cares," replied Tom, " for your intention" (pp. 195-196). That is to say—if the illustration means anything—Tom—and " Tom" is a representative man, representing the whole Roman Communion—no more adores the image than the Parson adores the bedpost. And yet, according to Cardinal Cajetan, the image is put in the Church " to be adored," while even " every Catholic child " knows that the bedpost is *not* put into the bedchamber to be adored, and is not adored. Which are we to believe ? Tom, or the Cardinal ? For my part I prefer to believe the Cardinal, backed, as he is, by the second Council of Nice, the *consensus* of a whole catena of theologians, and the well-known outward acts of Roman worship.

But, continues the Archbishop, " the moral rectitude or depravity of our actions cannot be determined without taking into account the intention."

Granted ; but I have a right to *infer* the intention from the manner of the act, and the circumstances by which it is surrounded. When I see a man draw his pistol, take deliberate aim at his neighbor, and shoot him down, I have a right to infer that he intended to shoot him. And when I see—and here comes in what I had to say about the nature of the worship of the Virgin and the Saints, and which I said on page 503 I would defer to this chapter—when I see the outward acts that are everywhere and by all, learned and unlearned, barbarous and civilized, recognized as the embodiment and expression of adoration—when I see these outward acts addressed to the Virgin, and the Saints, and their Images, I have a right to infer that they who thus address these acts, *adore* the Virgin, and the Saints, and their Images. They may tell us that they are only asking the prayers of the Saints as they ask the

prayers of their brethren here on earth, but the surrounding circumstances disprove it. Actions speak louder than words. "The *Ora pro nobis* of the Roman Church is more than a request for a fellow-Christian's prayers. It is uttered with all the signs of religious homage: on bended knee; in places and at times of Divine Service; to the strains of solemn music; with as much fervor and frequency as *Per Jesum Christum Dominum Nostrum*. How utterly unlike to the mutual intercessions of St. Paul and the faithful are the modern Roman litanies (vide, e.g., the Litany in *Ritual Romanum*, p. 104),* which pass without break or pause from the worship of the blessed TRINITY to supplicate the prayers of St. Mary, all the Apostles and Evangelists, all the holy Martyrs, all holy Bishops and Confessors and Doctors, Priests and Levites, Monks and Hermits, Virgins and Widows, Saints male and female; at least fifty of these being mentioned by name in as many separate petitions! Is it possible that these solemn and *systematic* invocations can fail to overshadow the mediatorship of our Saviour Christ?" (Swete, *England versus Rome*, pp. 95, 96).

No, it is *not* possible; and we know, as a matter of fact, that the Invocation of the Virgin does overshadow the Mediatorship of Christ. Witness such prayers as the following:

"O glorious Virgin Mary, I commit my soul and body to thy blessed trust this night and for ever, but more especially at the hour of my death. I recommend to thy merciful charity all my hopes, my consolations, my distress and misery, my life and the end thereof." *Litany of our Blessed Lady of Loretto*; ap. Swete, p. 97.

"Mary, Mother of grace, Mother of mercy, shield us from the Enemy, and receive us at the hour of

* Also that at the dedication of Cardinal McCloskey's Cathedral.

death." — *Ritual. Roman. de visitatione infirmorum. Ibid.*, p. 98.

How different the prayer of the dying Stephen, LORD JESUS, *receive my spirit!*

The Archbishop thinks "the outcry formerly raised against *images* has almost subsided;" and his reason for thinking so is that "some of our dissenting brethren [how mild he puts it!] are already beginning to recognize the utility of religious *symbols!*" It takes a surgical operation, it is said, to get a joke into a Scotchman's head: nothing short of one, I fear, will ever get the difference between a symbol and an image into the Archbishop's.

"Crosses already surmount some of our Protestant churches, and replace the weather-cock" (p. 204).

"Already," quotha? They were on *our* Churches before the Archbishop was born, but we never dreamed of worshipping them, any more than of worshipping the weather-cocks. They are both symbols; the latter a symbol, not of fickleness, but of change for cause, for it never veers except to catch the breath of heaven.

It is remarkable that the Archbishop says not a word of *Relics*, though the Catechism of the Council of Trent directs that the faithful "be accurately taught that . . . the honor which the Catholic Church has always paid even to the bodies and ashes of the saints, are not forbidden by this [the first—with us the second] commandment" (p. 328). There is *need*, certainly, of this teaching; else "the faithful" would be pretty certain to think such honoring *was* forbidden. Perhaps the Archbishop will account for the omission by saying he is "writing for the information of Protestants" (p. 196), not for the faithful. Pity, then, the "information" were not more complete and more trustworthy. I will endeavor to make up for its shortcoming on this head by an extract from one of the *Homilies* of the Church of England set forth in the time of Queen Elizabeth—the homily *Against Peril of Idolatry*:

“ Because Relics were so gainful, few places were there but that they had relics provided for them. And for more plenty of relics some one saint had many heads, one in one place, and another in another place. Some had six arms and twenty-six fingers. And where (whereas) our Lord bare His Cross alone, if all the pieces of the relics thereof were gathered together, the greatest ship in England would scarcely bear them. . . . And not only the bones of the saints, but everything appertaining to them was a holy relic. In some places they offer a sword, in some the scabbard, in some a shoe, in some a saddle that had been set upon some holy horse, in some the coals wherewith St. Lawrence was roasted, in some the tail of the ass which our Lord Jesus Christ sat on, to be kissed and offered unto as a relic.”

It seems hardly credible that such things should be, though they undoubtedly were, and are ; and I do not wonder that the Archbishop gives them a wide berth. The present Pope has stopped the sale of them, to prevent the faithful being any longer imposed upon.* But he should go further. Let him set forth at once an *Index Expurgatorius*, containing a list of all the spurious relics. Or if that be thought impracticable, by reason “ the world itself could not contain the books that should be written,” let him issue an *Index Authenticus*, containing a list of all the genuine relics. A very small volume would suffice for that ; and then the faithful will know what to worship. And this he can easily do, for he is infallible in the domain of faith and morals : and surely objects of worship are within that domain ;

* Perhaps he had heard of the keeper of a provincial museum, who, expatiating on curiosity after curiosity, held up at last a rusty old weapon and said : “ This is the sword that Balaam had when he was going to kill his ass. “ But,” suggested one of his visitors, “ Balaam hadn’t a sword ; he only wished he had one.” “ Your are right. I forgot. This is the sword that Balaam *wished* he had.”

for even the Archbishop will admit that to worship the relics of a heretic is idolatry. Let us have the *Index* then ; the sooner the better.

CHAPTER XV.

PURGATORY AND PRAYERS FOR THE DEAD.

OF the seventeen pages of this chapter, in the "little volume," sixteen are devoted to Prayer for the Dead, and are therefore supererogatory ; for who, that knows anything about it, does not know that it was the practice of the early Church, and that all the ancient Liturgies contain prayers for the faithful departed ? But what has all this to do with Purgatory ? Who were they that were thus prayed for ? Let the Liturgy of the Church of Constantinople, ascribed to St. Chrysostom, give the answer to this question, for itself, and for the others ; for I haven't room to quote from them all :

"We offer unto thee this reasonable service, for those who are at rest in the faith, our Forefathers, Fathers, Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apostles, Preachers, Evangelists, Martyrs, Confessors, Religious Persons, and every spirit perfected in the faith ; especially for our most holy, immaculate, most blessed Lady, the mother of God and ever-virgin Mary."

Was the Virgin in Purgatory ? If so she must have been there three or four hundred years when this liturgy was composed ; for Chrysostom wasn't Bishop of Constantinople till A.D. 398 : and the Patriarchs and Prophets must have been there a good deal longer. Leo Thuscus felt this difficulty, and undertook to get around it in his translation of the liturgy into Latin by rendering the passage thus :

“ We offer unto thee this reasonable service for the faithfully deceased, for our Fathers and Forefathers ; the Patriarchs, Prophets, Apostles, Martyrs, Confessors, and all the saints, interceding for them.” Adhuc offerimus tibi rationabile hoc obsequium pro fideliter dormientibus, pro patribus et proavis nostris ; intervenientibus Patriarchis, Prophetis, Apostolis, etc.—*Chrysos. Liturg. Latin.* (ap. Brog. ii. 124).

Thuscusc thus manages to kill two birds with one stone, not only not letting us pray for the Patriarchs, etc., but actually setting them to praying for us. And how does he do it? Simply by causing *intervenientibus* to *intervene*, where it has no business to be, there being nothing in the Greek to correspond to it. Turn out the intruder, and the translation will be correct, *Patriarchis*, etc., being construed with *pro*, as well as *dormientibus* and *patribus* ; just as the corresponding genitives in the Greek original are construed with *ὕπέρ*.

Thus we see that the prayers for the dead, in the ancient liturgies, were for souls in Paradise, not for souls in Purgatory.

The Archbishop quotes from the Oration of St. Ambrose on the death of the Emperor Theodosius, beginning with, “ Give perfect rest to thy servant Theodosius,” and ending with, “ Nor will I leave him until, by tears and prayers, I shall lead him [where his merits call him *] unto the holy mountain of the Lord, where is life undying,” etc. (p. 211.) (*De Obiit. Theod.* 36, 37.)

The Archbishop leaves out the five words which I have put in brackets (putting *dots* in their place), not because of the huge space they would occupy, but because the non-Roman reader, if allowed to read them, would see at once that if the merits of Theodosius called him to the holy mountain of the Lord, as Am-

* “ Quo sua merita vocant.”

brose said they did, he couldn't be in Purgatory. That Ambrose prayed for the soul of Theodosius, is plain from the Archbishop's quotation; but that it wasn't for his soul as being in Purgatory that he prayed, I will make plain by quoting a previous passage which the Archbishop *didn't* quote, though it is in the next preceding column, in Migne's edition:

"Theodosius of honorable memory, being freed from doubtful fight, doth now enjoy everlasting light and continual tranquillity; and for the things which he did in this body, he rejoiceth in the fruits of God's reward: because he loved the Lord his God, he hath obtained the society of the saints." Absolutus igitur dubio certamine, fruitur nunc augustæ memoriæ Theodosius luce perpetua, tranquillitate diuturna; et pro iis quæ in hoc gessit corpore, remunerationis divinæ fructibus gratulatur. Ergo quia dilexit augustæ memoriæ Theodosius Dominum Deum suum, meruit sanctorum consortia.—Ambros. *de Obit. Theod.* 32.

In the adjoining column on the opposite side, over against the Archbishop's extract, is the following:

"Theodosius remaineth in light, and glorieth in the company of the saints." Manet ergo in lumine Theodosius, et sanctorum cœtibus gloriatur.—*Id.* 39.

I might go on and give instance after instance; and I *will* give one more, from Bede's *Ecclesiastical History of England* (Book iv. chap. 23), where, giving an account of the death of Hilda, abbess of the monastery at Whitby, he relates how a nun at the monastery at Hackness, thirteen miles from Whitby, saw in her sleep Hilda's death, and awaking and perceiving that she had had a vision, she ran to the Abbess Frigyth, and told her that she had seen Hilda "ascend to eternal bliss, and to the company of the inhabitants of heaven, with a great light, and with angels conducting her. Frigyth having heard it, awoke all the sisters, and calling them to the church, admonished them to pray and

sing psalms for her soul, which they did during the remainder of the night."

This last instance shows that even after they had begun to pray for souls in purgatory, they still kept up the old practice of praying for souls *not* in purgatory.

But why did they pray for those who were at rest in paradise, and were awaiting with certainty their crown of glory at the Resurrection? For the same reason that we pray, "Thy kingdom come," adding immediately, "For thine is the kingdom;" God's kingdom being certain to come, and we being taught, nevertheless, to pray for its coming; a reason recognized even by Bellarmine, who says, "The Church prays for the souls in purgatory, that they may not be condemned to the everlasting pains of hell: not as if it were not certain that they would not be condemned to those pains, but that it is God's pleasure that we should pray even for those things which we are certain to receive; quia vult Deus nos orare etiam pro iis rebus quas certo accepturi sumus. — *De Purgatorio*, lib. ii. cap. 5 (Usher ap. Brogden, ii. p. 138). Our prayer, "Thy kingdom come," is an expression of our fellowship with that kingdom, and of our wish for its coming; and in like manner, our prayer for the faithful departed is an expression of our fellowship with them, and of our wish for their repose and final reward; in other words, it is an expression of our belief in the Communion of Saints. The Thirty-nine Articles say nothing against Prayers for the Dead in Christ. The first Prayer Book of King Edward retained them. The second dropped them out, because they had become so inextricably interwoven with purgatory, in the minds of the people, that the only way to get rid of the one was to forego, for a time, the use of the other. A hundred years later, the Commemoration in the Prayer for the Church Militant was restored; perhaps the other

prayers may be at some future day.* Meanwhile no clergyman has a right to use them in the Public Worship of the Church.

I have thus shown that the prayers for the dead, in the Early Church, had nothing whatever to do with Purgatory. The same is true (so far as the wording of it is concerned, however it may be in the intention of those who use it) of the Prayer in the Roman Missal, as given by the Archbishop (p. 214): "Remember, O Lord, Thy servants who are gone before us with the sign of faith, and sleep in peace. To these, O Lord, and to all who rest in Christ, grant, we beseech Thee, a place of refreshment,† light, and peace, through the same Jesus Christ our Lord." There is nothing of purgatory in this; nothing that any one might not use and yet deny the existence of purgatory.

"During my sojourn in Rome at the Ecumenical Council, I devoted a great deal of my leisure time to the examination of the various Liturgies of the schismatic churches of the East. I found in all of them formulas of prayers for the dead almost identical with that of the Roman Missal: "Remember," etc. [the one just given].

"Not content with studying their books, I called upon the Oriental Patriarchs and Bishops in communion with the See of Rome, who belong to the Armenian, the Chaldean, the Coptic, the Maronite, and Syriac rites. They all assured me that the schismatic Christians of the East among whom they live, have, without exception, prayers and sacrifices for the dead" (pp. 214, 215).

From this the Archbishop draws the conclusion that the "practice of praying for the dead" was in the

* No Protestant could well object to a petition like this, for a brother or sister who had departed in the faith of Christ: *May he (or she) have the joy of welcoming us to paradise.*

† See farther on, p. 785.

Church before the earliest of these schismatics separated from it—viz., in the fourth or fifth century ; a fact that nobody disputes. But he forgets (accidentally, of course) to tell his readers that the Orientals do *not* hold to purgatory. His brother-theologue Alphonsus de Castro shall give his memory a jog : “ The mention of purgatory in ancient writers, especially in the Greeks, is almost none at all. For which cause purgatory is not believed by the Greeks to this very day.” De purgatorio in atiquis scriptoribus potissimum Græcis fere nulla mentio est. Qua de causa usque in hodiernum diem purgatorium non est a Græcis creditum.—Alphonsus de Castro *advers. Hæres.* lib. viii. verbo Indulgentia. (Laud, Confer. with Fisher, London, 1639, p. 354 ; apud Brogden, vol. ii., p. 101.)

Having thus disposed of the fifteen or sixteen pages that the Archbishop devotes to prayers for the dead, I come now to the one or two that he devotes to purgatory. And first let us have the Archbishop’s definition of Purgatory.

“ The Catholic Church teaches that, besides a place of eternal torments for the wicked and of everlasting rest for the righteous, there exists in the next life a middle state of temporary punishment, allotted for those who have died in venial sin, or who have not satisfied the justice of God for sins already forgiven” (p. 204).

“ *Venial* sins” imply *mortal* sins ; and as the “ little volume” contains no explanation of the difference between the two, I shall seek one in a volume still smaller, but more complete—Archbishop Challoner’s *Catholic Christian Instructed* ; New York : The Catholic Publication Society :

“ All those sins are to be esteemed mortal, which the word of God represents to us as hateful to God, against which he pronounces a woe, or of which it

declares, that such as do those things shall not enter into the kingdom of heaven" (p. 137).

Can any one tell us what sins, according to this classification, are not mortal? Surely, all sins come under one or another of these three categories. Indeed, they all come under the first; for sin is in its very nature "hateful to God." Yet we are told by Dr. Chalonier, in the preceding paragraph, that Christians "are obliged to confess all such as are mortal, or of which they have reason to doubt lest they may be mortal; but they are not obliged to confess venial sins, because, as these do not exclude eternally from the kingdom of heaven, so there is not a strict obligation of having recourse for the remission of them to the keys of the church."

It is hardly necessary to say that the *Roman* division of sins into mortal and venial, has no warrant in the Word of God. Holy Scripture does indeed speak (1 St. John 5 : 16, 17) of "a sin unto death," and "a sin not unto death;" but the Note on this passage, in the pocket edition of the Archbishop's version, says, "It is hard to determine what St. John here calls a sin which is not unto death, and a sin which is unto death. The difference cannot be the same as betwixt sins that are called venial and mortal." And there is no other passage that gives even the slightest countenance to the *Roman* distinction. All sin repented of, even the most aggravated, is venial; all sin unrepented of, even the least aggravated, is mortal. There is a difference in the punishment of slight and of heinous sins, but it is a difference of intensity, not of duration; sin repented of hath full and free forgiveness; sin unrepented of hath never forgiveness. There is therefore no foundation for the Archbishop's two classes in Purgatory—"those who have died in [unforgiven] venial sin" and those "who have not satisfied the justice of God for [mortal] sins already forgiven." I mean,

there is no foundation for them in Scripture. Just as little foundation is there in it for the existence of Purgatory. Indeed the Archbishop brings forward but two passages in support of it from Canonical Scripture. But he prefaces them with a quotation from the Second Book of Maccabees ; and in doing it, he has the *impudence* to liken us, who reject that Book as no part of the Canon, to " a man who assassinates a hostile witness." A man must be a simpleton to assassinate a witness that has already been ruled out of court as incompetent. And this is the case with the witness in question. It was ruled out by the Jews (to whom, says St. Paul (Rom. 3 : 2) " were committed the oracles of God ") two thousand years ago, and by the Christians from the beginning down to the fourth century, as I have already shown (p. 75) by St. Jerome, the translator of the Latin Vulgate. I have also shown that the author of the book makes admissions (2 Macc. 15 : 39) concerning himself inconsistent with his being inspired. Here is a specimen of what Rome counts canonical : " When he (Razias) was ready to be (rather, on the point of being) taken, he struck himself with his sword, choosing to die nobly rather than to fall into the hands of the wicked " (2 Macc. 14 : 41, 42). Here we have the Archbishop and his Church claiming inspiration for a writer who, not only narrates a suicide, but commends it ; thereby making themselves *participes criminis* in the commendation. Think of an Archbishop commending suicide !

Foiled in his attempt to palm off upon us, in spite of the protest of St. Jerome, the Books of the Maccabees as inspired Scripture, the Archbishop comes down a peg, and is willing, " for the sake of argument," to appeal to them simply as " truthful [but not infallible] historical monuments." Let us meet him, then, on this ground, and see whether, as such, " they serve," as he alleges (p. 206) " to demonstrate that it was a prevailing

practice among the Hebrew people, as it is with us [*i.e.*, with the Roman Church], to offer up prayers and sacrifices for the dead." I give the passage in the Anglican Translation, which every Greek scholar who has compared it with the Septuagint Text as edited *juxta Exemplar Vaticanum* by Holmes and Lambert Bos, knows to be correct; whereas the Vulgate Latin Translation, from which the Douay Version is made is incorrect; and I begin with the 40th verse, whereas the Archbishop (for cogent reasons, as will presently be seen) begins with the 43d :

(40) "Now under the coats of every one that was slain [in the battle fought by Judas Maccabeus against Gorgias], they found things consecrated to the idols of the Jamnites, which is forbidden the Jews by the law. Then every man saw that this was the cause wherefore they were slain. (41) All men therefore praising the Lord, the righteous Judge, who had opened the things that were hid, (42) betook themselves unto prayer, and besought him that the sin committed might wholly be put out of remembrance. Besides that, noble Judas exhorted the people to keep themselves from sin, forasmuch as they saw before their eyes the things that came to pass for the sins of those that were slain. (43) And when he had made a gathering throughout the company, to the sum of two thousand drachms of silver, he sent it to Jerusalem to offer a sin-offering [so far is history; now come the historian's reflections], doing therein very well and honestly, in that he was mindful of the resurrection; (44) (for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead) : (45) and also in that he perceived that there was great favor laid up for those that died godly. (46) It was a holy and good thought. Whereupon he made a reconciliation for the dead, that they might be delivered from sin."

The Douay Version has in the place of "to offer a sin-offering," in verse 43 "for sacrifice to be offered for the sins of the dead;" vulgate, *pro peccatis mortuorum sacrificium*. The word *mortuorum*, "of the dead," has no business to be in the verse, there being nothing to correspond to it in the Greek. Leave that out, and put "sins in the singular, without the article, as it is in the Greek (*περὶ ἁμαρτίας θυσίαν*), and the *narrative* is plain, to wit, as Prideaux (*Connection*, Pt. ii. Bk. 4) paraphrases it: "Whereby perceiving for what cause God had given them up to be slain, Judas and all his company gave praise unto Him, and humbly offered up their prayers for the pardon of the sin [all the survivors being (after the analogy of Deut. 21 : 1-9, particularly verse 8) *ceremonially* involved in it]. And then making a collection through the whole company, which amounted to 2,000 drachms [not 12,000, as the Vulgate and the Douay have it], sent it to Jerusalem to provide sin-offerings, there to be offered up for the expiating this offence, that wrath for it might not fall upon the whole congregation of Israel, as formerly it had (Joshua 7 : 10-26) in the case of Achan."

What follows is the comment of the anonymous compiler of the history. For his facts he is indebted to the work of Jason, in five books: the comments are his own, and are of no authority, being simply his private opinions. Even these are grossly misrepresented by the Douay Version (the one quoted by the Archbishop), which, following the Vulgate, translates the last verse thus: "It is, therefore, a holy and wholesome thought to pray for the dead, that they may be loosed from sins." The original Greek puts a colon after thought, thereby making it refer to the resurrection, just before mentioned: the Douay, following the Vulgate, takes away the colon, thereby bring the word "thought" into seeming connection with what follows,

which is simply impossible in the Greek. The verse, literally translated, runs thus : " holy and pious (was) the thought : wherefore for (ὅθεν περὶ) the dead he made the expiation, to be loosed from the sin." *Who* to be loosed? Plainly Judas himself, and those with him : *not* the dead ; for to them, dying as they did in mortal sin, the sin of idolatry, there was under the Jewish law of old, as there is now according to the teaching of Rome herself, no loosing. Take the Roman representation of the passage, and it stands out, in solitary abnormity, the first instance, and the last, in all Jewish history from the beginning even unto this day, of prayer or sacrifice for the loosing of the dead from their sins. Josephus makes no mention of it, though he gives (*Antiquities*, B. xii. c. 7) an account of the battle. It all rests upon the authority of the anonymous *compiler* of the Second Book of Maccabees ; and even his compilation has to be falsified in the translation to make it speak as Rome wants it to speak ; and even then the Archbishop doesn't *dare* to quote the first part of the account, because it would show the reader that they for whom the offering is alleged to have been made died in mortal sin !

The Archbishop's triumphant question, then, " Did our Lord, at any time, reprove the Jews for their belief in a middle state, or for praying for the dead ?" is easily answered. He had no occasion to reprove them ; for their " middle state" was that which He Himself brings before us in the parable, with Abraham and Lazarus on this side the " great gulf," and Dives on that ; which certainly wasn't purgatory, for there was no passing from the one to the other ; and as to prayer for the loosing of the dead from their sins, they had it not. The prayers used by the Jews in their worship in the time of our Lord are still extant, and I challenge the Archbishop to point to a single petition in them for the loosing of the dead from their sins. And

I extend the challenge to take in the Jewish prayers of the present day ; for in the long extract which he gives from them on page 216 of his book, the reader will search in vain for any such petition. The petitions in the extract given by him are of the same class as those in use in the early Church, and are as wide apart from those of modern Rome as purgatory is from paradise ; and that is an infinite distance.

I come now to the Archbishop's proofs from *inspired* Scripture. Of these he gives but two, having come, doubtless, to the sound conclusion that that about the sinner's not coming out till he has paid the uttermost farthing, does not refer to purgatory, seeing he can never pay it.

His first proof is from St. Matt. 12 : 32 : " Whosoever speaketh against the Holy Ghost, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world nor in the world to come." But this won't prove purgatory, for three reasons :

1. We can't conclude logically that because one sin will *not* be forgiven hereafter, other sins will. As Cardinal Bellarmine admits, " The inference does not follow from the premises ;" *non sequi secundum regulas dialecticorum*.—*De Purg.* l. i. c 4. t. ii. p. 393, B. Coloniae, 1628." (Hall on Purgatory, Lond. 1843, p. 49.)

2. Granting, for argument's sake, that " there are some sins which will be pardoned in the life to come," they must be the sins of those who have never heard of Christ in this life. That is the very utmost that the text can *prove*. But these do not go to purgatory : *that* is only for "*faithful souls*, which have departed hence *in a state of grace*." "*Est a fide catholica alienum*," says Thomas Aquinas (*Summa Theol. Suppl. Quæst.* 100 *de Purg.* Duaci, 1614. Ap. Hall on Purg., p. 15), "*negare purgatorium fidelium animarum quæ hinc in statu gratiæ decesserint*."

3. Purgatory, according to the teaching of Rome, is

for purgation and penalty, not for forgiveness : there are but two classes that go there ; one, to suffer the *residuum* of temporal penalty, or, as the Archbishop puts it (p. 205), *to satisfy the justice of God for sins already forgiven* ; the other, to *expiate*, not to obtain forgiveness of, the *guilt* of venial sin : for, “ *per pœnas Purgatorii*,” says Bellarmine (*de Purg.* l. ii. c. 6, t. ii. p. 410, C. Ap. Hall, p. 14). “ *peccatum veniale expiatur ETIAM QUOAD CULPAM* ;” *i.e.*, “ by the pains of Purgatory venial sin is expiated *even in respect of its guilt*.” It is plain, therefore, that it needs no forgiveness. We are taught to pray, *Forgive us our debts as we forgive our debtors*. If my creditor is unable to pay me, and I give him a release, I forgive him the debt ; but if he pays me in full, and I give him a receipt, that is not forgiveness. It is plain, then, that as the text from St. Matthew speaks of forgiveness and not of penalty, and purgatory speaks of penalty and not of forgiveness, there is no connection between the two.

The Archbishop's second and only remaining proof from *inspired* Scripture is found in 1 Cor. 3 : 11–15 : “ For other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ. Now if any man build upon this foundation gold, silver, precious stones, wood, hay, stubble ; every man's work shall be made manifest : for the day shall declare it, because it shall be revealed by fire ; and the fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward. If any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss : but he himself shall be saved ; yet so as by fire.”

On this the Archbishop comments thus : “ His soul will be ultimately saved, but he shall suffer, for a temporary duration, in the purifying flames of Purgatory. This interpretation is not mine. It is the unanimous voice of the Fathers of Christendom” (p. 208).

The interpretation in question is *not* the unanimous

voice of the Fathers of Christendom. "Clement of Alexandria, Ambrose, and Jerome," says Hall, (*Doctrine of Purgatory*, p. 55), "declare that the '*gold, silver, and precious stones*' signify 'catholic interpretations;,' and that '*the wood, hay, and stubble*' signify 'heresies.' " Of course, therefore, they do *not* interpret the words of purgatory, for heretics are not admitted into *it*, and therefore their "heresies" cannot be burned up in it. "Origen, Jerome, Augustine," continues Hall, "together with Bernard and Bede, regard the '*fire*' as the emblem of 'temporal tribulation before death.'" Even Pope Gregory the Great admits that it may be so interpreted. His words (*Dial.* l. iv. c. 39, col 442, Paris, 1705), as quoted by Hall in a foot-note, are, "*de igne tribulationis in hac nobis vita adhibito possit intelligi*;" i.e., "it may be understood of tribulation applied to us in this life." "Lactantius, Basil, and Ambrose," continues Hall, "apply it to the general conflagration at the day of judgment: while Gregory Nazianzen, Chrysostom, Theodoret, and Theophylact affirm it to be hell itself."

Here are no fewer than thirteen Fathers, to whom might be added Hilary, as I will presently show, making fourteen in all, several of them saints of the Roman Calendar, every one of whom interprets the passage otherwise than of Purgatory. And yet the Archbishop has the *courage* to tell his unsuspecting reader that the Fathers unanimously interpret the passage as he does! If he had no fear of Protestants before his eyes, he might at least have had the modesty not to go in the teeth of his own Cardinal Bellarmine, who, speaking of the Fathers (*de Purg.* l. ii. c. 1, t. ii. p. 405, G. ap. Hall, p. 168), says, "*Aliqui eorum (patrum) per ignem non intelligunt ignem purgatorium, sed ignem divini judicii. Ita videntur loqui Hilarius, Hieronymus, et in loco posteriore (Ps. 118) Ambrosius:*" i.e., "Some of them (the Fathers) understand

by it not the fire of purgatory, but the fire of divine judgment. So seem to speak Hilary, Jerome, and in a later place Ambrose." He might have added Augustine, who says expressly (*in Psal. vi. c. 3*), *Arguuntur autem in die judicii omnes qui non habent fundamentum, quod est Christus: emendantur autem, id est purgantur, qui huic fundamento superædificant lignum, fœnum, stipulam. Detrimentum enim patientur, sed salvi erunt tanquam per ignem*"—*i.e.*, "All are convicted *in the day of judgment* who have not the foundation, which is Christ. But *they* are amended (in the day of judgment)—*i.e.*, purified, who build, upon this foundation, wood, hay, and stubble: for they *shall* suffer (not *shall have* suffered) loss, but yet they shall be saved, so as by fire." And again (*in Psal. ciii., Serm. 3*), "*Hoc agit caminus: alios in sinistram separabit, alios in dextram quodammodo eliquabit:*" *i.e.*, "This is what the furnace does: it will separate some to the left hand, and others it will refine, as it were, and place them on the right." And says Ambrose (*in Psal. cxviii. Serm. 3*), "*Post consummationem sæculi, missis angelis qui segregent bonos et malos, hoc futurum est baptisma: quando per caminum ignis iniquitas exuretur, ut in regno Dei fulgeant justi sicut sol ipse in regno patris sui. Et si aliquis sanctus ut Petrus sit, ut Johannes, baptizatur hoc igne:*" *i.e.*, "*After the end of the world, when the angels shall be sent to separate the good from the bad, then this baptism shall commence, and iniquity shall be consumed in the furnace of fire, that the just may shine as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Though any one were holy as Peter and John, yet is he baptized with this fire.*" "*Justos cum judicaverit,*" says Lactantius (*Divin. Instit. l. vii. c. 21, vol. ii. pp. 146, 147, Ed. Bipont.*), "*Deus etiam igni eos examinabit. Tum quorum peccata vel pondere vel numero prævaluerint perstringentur ab igni, amburentur. Quos autem plena justitia,*

et maturitas virtutis incoxerit, ignem illam non sentient. . . . Nec tamen quisquam putet, animas post mortem protinus judicari. Omnes in una communique custodia detinentur, donec tempus adveniat, quo maximus Index meritorum faciat examen :” *i.e.*, “ *When God shall judge the just, he shall examine them even with fire. Then those whose sins shall exceed in number or magnitude, shall be scorched by the fire. But they who have been imbued with complete righteousness and maturity of virtue, shall not feel that fire.* . . .

Let not any one suppose, however, that souls are judged immediately after death. *All are detained in one common custody until the time shall arrive when the great Judge shall make EXAMINATION of their deserts.*”

“An, cum ex omni otioso verbo,” says Hilary (in *Psalm cxviii.* (our *cxix.*), *Gimel*, 12), rationem simus præstaturi, diem judicii concupiscemus, in quo nobis est ille indefessus ignis subeundus? in quo subeunda sunt gravia illa expiandæ a peccatis animæ supplicia? Beatæ Mariæ animam gladius pertransibit, ut revelentur multorum cordium cogitationes. Si in judicii severitatem capax illa Dei Virgo ventura est, desiderare quis audebit a Deo judicari?”—*i.e.*, Since for every idle word we must give account, can we desire *the day of judgment*, IN WHICH that unwearied fire must be undergone and those severe punishments endured for the expiation of the soul from sins? A sword shall pass through the soul of the Blessed Mary, that the thoughts of many hearts may be revealed. If therefore *that Virgin Bearer of God (capax Dei) will come into the severity of judgment*, who shall dare desire to be judged by God?”

Here are four of the fourteen Fathers above-mentioned—three of them Saints of the Roman Calendar—who say expressly that the burning of the “wood, hay, and stubble,” and the saving “so as by fire,” is at the day of judgment; and yet the Archbishop coolly declares that they represent it as being not at the day of

judgment, but in Purgatory, which is *before* the day of judgment!

I might quote passage after passage that I have marked (for *I* don't deal in wholesale assertions that can't be substantiated) from other Fathers, in the teeth of the Archbishop's assertion; but I have not room for them, nor is there need of them.

There is a passage in St. Cyprian (Epistle 55) which is cited to prove Purgatory, but which refers not to Purgatory, but to the penitential discipline in the early Church, as may be seen *proved* at large by Hall (*Doctrine of Purgatory*, pp. 115-121) and Bp. Hopkins (*End of Controversy Controverted*, vol. ii., pp. 308-312). It would take more space than I can spare to give a full account of it; so I shall content myself with another passage of Cyprian—one of seven that I have marked in the Folio edition of his Works, Oxford, 1682, all to the same effect—which is in direct antagonism to the doctrine of Purgatory: “Quando istinc excessum fuerit, nullus jam pœnitentiæ locus est, nullus *satisfactionis* effectus; hic vita aut amittitur, aut tenetur” (p. 196): *i.e.*, “When we have departed hence, there is no more place for repentance, nor effecting of *satisfaction*; it is *here* that life is either lost or secured.” Observe the word “satisfaction,” and mark what the Archbishop says of Purgatory (p. 205), to wit, that it is “allotted for those who have died in venial sin, or who have not *satisfied* the justice of God for sins already forgiven.” According to St. Cyprian, there is no making of satisfaction after we have departed this life; according to the Archbishop, we may make satisfaction in Purgatory. It is plain, therefore, that the Archbishop's Purgatory was unknown to St. Cyprian, and therefore unknown to the Church of his day, that is to say, of the middle of the third century.

St. Augustine, who flourished a century and a half later, and who, as we have seen, referred the being

“ saved so as by fire ” to the day of judgment, is in accord with St. Cyprian ; for he says (Serm. ccclxxxvii. t. v. col. 1699. ed. Migne) : “ Postea, cum de hoc sæculo transierimus, nulla compositio vel aliqua *satisfactio* remanebit : ” *i.e.*, “ Afterwards, when we have departed out of this life, there will remain no agreement (with our adversary, St. Matt. 5 : 25) nor any *satisfaction*. ” Elsewhere, however, he speaks doubtingly : “ Tale aliquid etiam post hanc vitam fieri incredibile non est ; et utrum ita sit quæri potest, et aut inveniri aut latere, nonnullos fideles per ignem quendam purgatorium, quanto magis minusve bona pereuntia dilexerunt, tanto tardius citiusve salvari (*Enchirid.* c. 69) : *i.e.*, “ That some such thing may take place after this life is not incredible ; and inquiry may be made whether it be so, and it may be found, or it may not, that some believers, through a certain purgatorial fire, are later or sooner saved, according as they have more or less loved perishable goods. ” This is the nearest approach he makes to Purgatory, and the doubting way in which he speaks of it—“ it may be found, or it may not ”—shows, that, in his day—to wit, in the first quarter of the Fifth Century, though it was creeping in, it had not yet become the doctrine of the Church. This is admitted by some even of the Roman writers. I have already (p. 223) quoted from Alphonsus de Castro. I will now quote from Cardinal Fisher, Bishop of Rochester in the time of Henry VIII., and who was put to death by that monarch for refusing to accept the Royal Supremacy in place of the Papal. Here is what he says (*Assert. Luther. Confut.*, Art. xviii., col. 496, 497. Wirceb. 1597, ap. Hall, p. 174) on the matter in hand : “ Legat qui velit Græcorum veterum commentarios, et nullum quantum opinor, aut quam rarissimum, de Purgatorio sermonem inveniet. Sed neque Latini, simul omnes ac sensim, hujus rei veritatem conceperunt : ” *i.e.*, “ Read who will the commentaries of the ancient

Greeks, and he will find no speech, as I think, or the very rarest, of Purgatory. Nor did the Latins all at once, but gradually conceive the truth of it." And says Father Barnes, about A.D. 1625 (*Catholico-Rom. Pacif.*, sec. ix., p. 130, D. ad fin. Paralip. Oxon. 1680, ap. Hall, p. 175), "Punitio ergo in Purgatorio est res in opinione humana posita : quæ nec ex Scripturis nec Patribus, nec Conciliis, deduci potest firmiter. Immo, salvo meliore judicio, opposita sententia eis conformior videtur : " *i.e.*, " Punishment in Purgatory is a doctrine seated in human opinion. Neither from Scripture *nor from the Fathers*, nor from the (earlier) Councils, can it be firmly deduced. Nay, with submission to better judgment, the contrary opinion seems more conformable to them."

After this it would be superfluous to cite the numerous passages I have marked from the Fathers before the time of Augustine, all of the same purport with this of Ambrose (*in Psal.* 40 (41) 2 ; "shall be blessed upon the earth") : " Bene addidit *in terra*, quia nisi *hic* mundatus fuerit, *ibi* mundus esse non poterit : " *i.e.*, " He has well added *upon earth* ; for if one be not cleansed *here*, he cannot be clean *there*."

Having thus vindicated the Fathers and the Church of the first six centuries, from the slanderous imputations of the Archbishop, let me recall to the reader what the Roman Doctrine of Purgatory is, and then give it the *coup de grace* from the Apocrypha and from Holy Scripture.

" Hell, then," says the *Catechism of the Council of Trent* (Donovan's Translation, Baltimore, John Murphy, pp. 62, 63), " here (in the Creed) signifies those secret abodes in which are detained the souls that have not been admitted to the regions of bliss. . . .

" These abodes are not all of the same nature, for amongst them is that most loathsome and dark prison in which the souls of the damned are buried. . . .

Amongst them is also the fire of purgatory, in which the souls of just men [mark that word *just*] are cleansed by a temporary punishment," etc.

Again (pp. 63-65) : " This we shall easily understand by comparing the descent of Christ . . . with that of the just. They (the just) descended as captives ; He as free and victorious, . . . they (the just) descended, some [of the just] to endure *the most acute torments*, others, though exempt from actual pain, yet deprived of the vision of God. . . . Christ the Lord descended, not to suffer, but to *liberate from suffering* the *holy* and the *just*. . . . Before His death and resurrection heaven was closed against every child of Adam : the souls of the just, on their departure from this life, were borne to the bosom of Abraham ; or, *as is still the case with those who* [though *holy* and *just*] *require to be freed from the stain of sin, or die indebted to the divine justice*, were purified in the fire of purgatory."

Besides these there is another passage which Hall, in his treatise on Purgatory (p. 17), quotes from the *Catechismus ad Parochos* (the Latin title of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*), p. 74, Lugduni, 1579, but which Donovan, for some reason or other, does not give in his Translation. It runs thus : " *Pœna Purgatorii excedit omnem pœnam temporalem hujus vitæ :*" *i.e.*, " The punishment of Purgatory surpasses all temporal punishment of this life." This is in accordance with what Cardinal Bellarmine says (*de Purgat.* l. ii. c. 6, t. ii., p. 410, C. Colonix, 1628, ap. Hall) : " *Theologi fere omnes docent eodem in loco esse, et eodem igne torqueri, damnatos et animas Purgatorii :*" *i.e.*, " Almost all Theologians teach that the damned, and the souls in Purgatory, are in the same place, and *tortured in the same fire.*"

Now those that are thus tortured are, as we have seen, the " holy" and " just," or, as Thomas Aquinas

expresses it in the passage quoted by me above (p. 229), "*faithful souls* that have departed hence *in a state of grace*"—in other words, *the dead in Christ*: for those who die *out of Christ* go, according to Rome, straight to hell. The dead in Christ, therefore (with the exception of the martyrs and eminent saints, who are said to go straight to glory), are, according to Rome, tortured in the same fire with the damned in hell!

To this atrocious teaching, for all which Rome is responsible until she puts Bellarmine in the Index, I oppose the opening verses of the third chapter of the Book of Wisdom, which Rome accounts canonical: "But the souls of the righteous are in the hand of God, and *there shall no torment touch them*.* In the sight of the unwise, they seemed to die: and their departure is taken for misery, and their going from us to be utter destruction: *but they are in peace*:" and to "make assurance doubly sure," I meet and vanquish it with a passage of Holy Writ which utterly annihilates the whole doctrine of Purgatory: "I heard *a voice from heaven* saying unto me, Write, Blessed are the dead *which die in the Lord* from henceforth: Yea, saith the Spirit, that they may *rest from their labors*; and their works do follow them."

CHAPTER XVI.

CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY.

"A MAN enjoys *religious* liberty," says the Archbishop, "when he possesses the free right of worship-

* The Douay, following the Vulgate, reads, "the torment *of death* shall not touch them." But as Du Hamel, in his edition of the Vulgate, Venice, 1741, published "*superiorum permissu*," rightly says, in a note on the passage, "*Vox, mortis, de-est in Græco*:" i.e., "The words, *of death*, are wanting in the Greek."

ping God according to the dictates of a right conscience, and of practising a form of religion most in accordance with his duties to God."

This is a definition that Torquemada himself would agree to. I had always thought that a man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right to worship God according to the dictates of *his own* conscience. But no, says the Archbishop: if he is a Protestant or a non-Roman, his conscience is a wrong conscience; the only right conscience is a conscience in accordance with the Roman Church, and therefore a man enjoys religious liberty when he possesses the free right to worship God according to the dictates of the Roman Church. I defy any one to make anything else out of the Archbishop's definition of *religious* liberty.

He next defines *civil* liberty, and then adds:

"I here assert the proposition, which I hope to confirm by historical evidence, that the Catholic Church has always been the zealous promoter of religious and civil liberty; and that whenever any encroachments on these sacred rights of man were perpetrated by professing members of the Catholic faith, these wrongs, far from being sanctioned by the Church, were committed in palpable violation of her authority" (p. 222).

That the Roman Church "has always been the zealous promoter" of religious liberty, *as above defined by the Archbishop*, nobody doubts; and therefore he might have spared himself the trouble of "confirming" the proposition "by historical evidence." But more of this by and by. Let us first consider the two brief paragraphs (less than half a page, out of the eighteen pages that follow) on *civil* liberty:

"The greatest bulwark of civil liberty is the famous *Magna Charta*. It is the foundation not only of British, but also of American constitutional freedom. Among other blessings contained in this instrument, it

establishes trial by jury, and the right of *Habeas Corpus*, and provides that there shall be no taxation without representation.

“Who were the framers of this memorable charter? Archbishop Langton and the Catholic barons of England. On the plains of Runnymede, in 1215, they compelled King John to sign that paper, which was the death-blow to his arbitrary power and the cornerstone of constitutional government” (p. 229).

So far, all goes on swimmingly. But the Archbishop *conveniently* forgets to tell his readers that Pope Innocent III. *annulled* MAGNA CHARTA, ordered Langton to excommunicate the recalcitrant Barons, and on his refusal suspended him permanently from his office, excommunicated the Barons himself, and laid the city of London under an Interdict! All of which they will find in the Archbishop's own historian Lingard, *History of England*, author's last, revised edition, *John*, A.D. 1215, Aug. 24, 25, Dec. 16.

Leaving the Archbishop to his reflections, and the reader to *his*, I return to the consideration of the other branch of the subject, to wit, *religious* liberty. On page 226 the Archbishop undertakes to correct “a great mistake, which comes from not knowing the Catholic doctrine in its fulness. I shall not lay it down myself,” he says, “lest it seem to have been gotten up for the occasion. I shall quote the great theologian Becanus, who taught the doctrine of the schools of Catholic Theology at the time when the struggle was hottest between Catholicity and Protestantism. He says that religious liberty may be tolerated by a ruler when it would do more harm to the state or to the community to repress it.”

Reader, what do you think the Archbishop quotes this last sentence for? You will hardly believe it, but I assure you it is true, and if you will look in his book in the page preceding this you will see for yourself.

He actually quotes it to reassure American citizens, alarmed for their religious liberty in the event of Rome's "getting the upper hand in numbers and power." The burden of his dehortation is, Don't be alarmed ! I assure you there is no occasion for it. If we get the upper hand, we shall tolerate you so long as it will do more harm *not* to tolerate you ; but as soon as the time comes—and of that we are to be the judge—when it *won't* do more harm not to tolerate you, then we shall not tolerate you ! Very reassuring, isn't it ?

And then that word "tolerate !" Who are you that thus *dare* to talk—for it is *your* talk, though the words are Becanus's ; for you make them your own, and say expressly that they are "Catholic doctrine"—who are you that thus *dare* to talk of "*tolerating*" our "religious liberty ?" I scorn to be "*tolerated*" in the enjoyment of that which is my birthright. Like him whose blood flows in my veins, the first Governor Dudley of Massachusetts, but for a *very* different reason, I cry out, from the bottom of my soul, and with all the strength that is in me, against this un-American, un-nineteenth - century, "intolerable toleration." You forgot yourself, and whom you were talking to, when you used that word ! Keep it for your bondmen ! To think of a man who can thus talk to us of *tolerating* our birthright, of *tolerating* what he himself (though evidently it is with him only a rhetorical flourish) a little further on (p. 237) calls "the God-given rights of conscience"—to think of such a man being at the head of the Roman Hierarchy in the United States !

But we have not yet finished his quotation from Becanus :

"The ruler may even [*may even ! think of that, reader*] enter into a compact in order to secure to his subjects this freedom in religious matters ; and when once a compact is made, it must absolutely be observed in every point, just as every other lawful and honest

contract" (Becanus *de Virtutibus Theologicis*, c. 16, quæst. 4, No. 2). This is the true Catholic teaching on this point according to Becanus and all Catholic theologians. So that if Catholics should gain the majority in a community where freedom of conscience is already secured to all by law, their very religion obliges them to respect the rights thus acquired by their fellow-citizens. What danger can there be, then, for Protestants if Catholics should be in the majority here? Their apprehensions are the result of vain fears which no honest mind ought any longer to harbor" (p. 226).

" Will you walk into my parlor
Said the spider to the fly?"

Thank you, No! If it is all the same to you, I had rather stay out. *Timeo ROMANOS*, etc. The metre is bad; but, as Peter Quince says, "Never sacrifice sense to sound." In the patriotism of the Carrolls and the Taneyes in this country, and the Beaumonts, the Norfolks, and the Camoys in England, of whom more by and by, I have the utmost confidence; in the Roman *Curia* and its tools—him of Westminster and him of Baltimore—none at all. Has the Archbishop forgotten, or does he think *we* have, that King John made a compact, of the very kind specified by Becanus, with the "Catholic Barons," and that Pope Innocent III., who may be presumed to have known as well as Becanus what was "true Catholic teaching," trampled it under foot? Has he forgotten, or does he think *we* have, that the Council of Constance violated the Imperial safe-conduct under the protection of which John Huss came within its power, and with a disregard of plighted faith that an American savage would have deemed it an everlasting *infamy* to have been guilty of, burnt him alive? Has he forgotten, or does he think *we* have, that Pope Innocent X., in his Bull of 20th November,

1648, "*Zelus Domus Dei*," condemns the Peace of Westphalia as "null and void, and of no effect or authority for past, present, or future," adding that "no one, though he had sworn to observe the Peace, is bound to keep his oath?" See the original in *Fanus*, p. 30, n.

Coming down to our own time—for "Rome never changes"—Has he forgotten, or does he think *we* have, that "in 1824, Leo. XII. addressed a letter to Louis XVIII., pointing out the badness of the French Constitution, and urgently pressing him to expunge from the charter those articles which savored of liberalism?"—that "soon after the establishment of the new Belgian Constitution in 1832, Gregory XVI. issued his famous Encyclical, *recently used and confirmed by Pius IX.*, which pronounces freedom of conscience an insane folly, and freedom of the press a pestiferous error, which cannot be sufficiently detested?"—that "the attempt of the Congress of Malines in 1863 was wrecked;" the "Syllabus" of Pius IX. having "pronounced sentence of death on its programme, so eloquently set forth by Montalembert, *for reconciling the Church with civil freedom*?"—that "in Italy, the Papal Government has used every effort to deter Austria and the other Italian sovereigns from granting parliamentary and free municipal institutions?"—that "the Roman Court declared that it could not suffer *even the very mildest forms* of parliamentary government in its neighborhood *on account of the bad example*?"—that "the mild and just Grand Duke Leopold of Tuscany was compelled, against his will, under pressure from Rome, to abolish that article of the Constitution which asserted the equality of all citizens before the law, *without distinction of religion*, because the Pope declared that it could not be promulgated "*tuta conscientia*?"—that "the Bavarian Constitution, with its equality of religious confessions, and of all citizens before the law, is looked on with an evil eye at Rome?"—and, finally, that "the Austrian Consti-

tution has drawn on itself the curse of the Vatican," as witness the following from "the Allocution of 22d June, 1868:" "By our apostolic authority we reject and condemn the above-mentioned (new Austrian) laws in general, and in particular all that has been ordered, done, or enacted in these and other things against the rights of the Church by the Austrian Government or its subordinates; by the same authority we declare these laws and their consequences to have been, and to be for the future, null and void (*nulliusque roboris fuisse ac fore*). We exhort and adjure their authors, especially those who call themselves Catholics, and all who have dared to propose, to accept, to approve, and to execute them, to remember the censures and spiritual penalties incurred *ipso facto*, according to the apostolical constitutions and decrees of the Ecumenical Councils, by those who violate the rights of the Church"? See all this, and a good deal more to the same effect, not only asserted, but *proved* by incontestable authorities, in the chapter on the Syllabus, in *The Pope and the Council*, by Janus: Rivingtons, London, Oxford, and Cambridge; Scribner, Welford Co., New York, 1869 (pp. 8-33).

The following is from the Encyclical above referred to, as translated in the *Dublin Review* for April, 1865:

"Against the doctrine of Scripture, of the Church, and of the Holy Fathers, they do not hesitate to assert that 'That is the best condition of society, in which no duty is recognized as attached to the civil power, of restraining, by enacted penalties, offenders against the Catholic religion, except so far as the public peace may require.' From which totally false idea of social government they do not fear to foster that erroneous opinion, most fatal in its effects on the Catholic Church and the salvation of souls, called by our predecessor Gregory XVI. *an insanity*, viz., that 'liberty of conscience and worships is each man's personal right. . . .' But while they rashly affirm this, they do not

think and consider that they are preaching *the liberty of perdition.*”

Here we have Gregory XVI. calling the doctrine of “each man’s personal right” to “liberty of conscience and worships” *an insanity*, and Pius IX. declaring it to be *the liberty of perdition*, and “most fatal in its effects on the Catholic [meaning thereby the Roman] Church.” In the face of these *authoritative* declarations of *Infallibility*—for “liberty of conscience and worships” is clearly within the sphere of “faith and morals”—what do the “eloquent voice” of Bernard, and the “beautiful letter” of Fenelon, paraded with such a flourish of trumpets by the Archbishop (p. 224), amount to? Can fallibility offset infallibility?

The mention of Fenelon reminds me of the Archbishop’s paragraph on the education of girls: “It is well known,” he says, “that the superior advantages of our female academies throughout the country lead many of our dissenting brethren to send their daughters to these institutions” (p. 225). Their *only* “superior advantage” is their cheapness. It would be much more commendable in the Sisters who give themselves to the work of educating the daughters of Protestants at a low charge, if they would set about giving a good secular as well as religious education to their sisters of their own communion in the humbler walks of life, instead of leaving them to grow up (secularly) almost if not wholly uncared for. Their own translation of 1 Tim. 5:8 could tell them that “if any man have not care of his own, and especially of those of his house, he hath denied the faith, and is worse than an infidel.” One of the good effects of the “liberty of conscience and worships” in the city of Rome under the new régime is, that it has compelled the present Pope to inaugurate a system of popular education, instead of leaving the humbler classes to grow up, as under his predecessor, in squalid ignorance.

I have said that cheapness is the only *superior* advantage of the schools in question. Against this is to be set the *supreme* disadvantage of the risk, nay, the probability, of the perversion of young, and therefore susceptible, minds and hearts exposed to subtle influences which surround them like an atmosphere, and which they breathe in unconsciously. The Archbishop understands this, for he tells us that the pupils "often beg to embrace a religion which fosters," etc. But "do the sisters take advantage of this influence in the cause of proselytism? By no means." Not they. They know too well that "in vain is the net spread in the sight of any bird." So they let things take their course, being shrewd enough to perceive that that is the surest way of gaining their end. This shrewdness of the sisters the Archbishop sets to the account of delicacy. "So delicate," says he, "is their regard for the religious conscience of their pupils, that they rarely consent to have these young ladies baptized till they have obtained the free permission of their parents or guardians." They *rarely* consent. They do consent, then, sometimes. Remember that, fathers and mothers, when you are thinking of putting your daughters with them; for if those daughters are perverted, the responsibility will be upon you. Remember, too, that though you secure their education at a moderate charge, you may be paying dear for it nevertheless. You would not send them to one of the Pope's new schools in Rome, to continue there year after year, exposed during summer to the malaria of the Pomptine Marshes, even if the school were the best in Christendom, and the Pope were to offer to educate them for nothing. And yet you expose them to a moral miasma as much worse than the physical, as the soul, on which it brings its blight, is more precious than the body. It looks very disinterested in Rome to be thus educating the daughters of Protestants at a low charge; but we

may be sure of one thing : she is not reckoning without her host. All is fish that comes to her net ; and she has hauled, from these schools, some big fish, that have brought their tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, into her coffers. If all that she has thus received were added to the tuition money paid her by Protestant pupils, and the aggregate averaged among the whole number of those pupils, perhaps the figures would be found considerably higher than those on the Protestant school-bills.

The Archbishop says nothing about schools for boys. Let the *Southern Churchman*, of August 22d, 1878, supply the omission :

“ A Mr. Petre, an English Roman Catholic, has lately published a pamphlet, ‘ Catholic Systems of School Discipline,’ in which he gives the testimony derived from his own investigation and experience. He was educated at a Jesuit college, but is ‘ thoroughly persuaded that the system pursued in Roman Catholic schools is out of tone with the age and in some respects pernicious.’ At Stonyhurst College, where Mr. Petre was educated, at no hour of the day were the boys allowed to be out of the sight of a master. The boys had no separate rooms, all studying, reading, or taking their recreation in the presence of schoolmates or instructors. There was a playground surrounded by a stone wall and having on its barren surface some eight or ten trees ; except under the most exceptional circumstances no boy was allowed to leave this square. The scholars were not expected to walk about in couples in conversation. If talking in couples was at all persisted in the parties were liable to arbitrary separation. There was a special fear of “ particular friendships ” in the school, and hence Stonyhurst boys would not have liked to be seen shaking hands or walking arm in arm. The religious life, too, was propor-

tionately narrow and restrained. The instructors must necessarily be drawn from the narrow limits of the order, and are generally young scholastics who are appointed to teach as a matter of training. The spiritual father ought naturally to have been chosen with regard to his sympathy with the boys in their eccentricities, troubles, and difficulties. But he did not gain their confidence and rarely met with them for personal religious aid. So it is with all Jesuit schools, according to Mr. Petre. The much-lauded Jesuit college is conducted on principles of suspicion calculated to repress instead of cultivating manliness in the boy ; governed by rules as unreasonable as they are arbitrary, and with a religious influence that is cold, heartless, and mechanical."

Such was, fifty or sixty years ago (and I presume is still) the system of discipline at the Jesuit College at Georgetown, D. C., as I was informed, many years since, by one who, being, when a boy, resident in the District, received his preparatory training at the College, but was afterwards graduated at Harvard University, in the Class of 1826. I refer to the late Cornelius McLean, Esq., Member of the Maryland Bar, Secretary of State under Governor Grason, and Auditor of the Court of Chancery. He gave me a detailed account of the discipline of the College as it was carried out in his time. There was a sort of *tessera*—I am not certain what the name of it was—that a boy who had violated the rules was obliged to carry about him till he found another boy violating the rules, when he could pass it to *him* ; and *he*, in his turn, must keep it till he found another to pass it to, and so on. Thus the boys were made *spies* upon one another. Indeed, the whole system was one of *espionage*, calculated, and, doubtless, designed to destroy all manliness of character, and break down all confidence between boy and

boy ; in short, to be *a slow murder* of the boy's moral nature. Even a heathen* could say, *Maxima debetur puero reverentia*, and many a heathen parent felt the force of the maxim and acted upon it. But your true Jesuit has no reverence for aught of human kind. He is, by the necessity of his position and training, *hostis humani generis*. "Man delights him not, nor woman neither:" and as for childhood, he looks upon it simply as material out of which to mould *machines*, to do remorselessly his bidding. That I am not alone in my estimate of Ultramontane Jesuitism, and its system of education, may be seen from the following, which I take from the *Southern Churchman* of November 14th, 1878 :

"ENGLISH ROMAN CATHOLICS AND ULTRAMONTANISM.

"Some signs of an incipient reaction against Ultramontaniam are apparent among English Roman Catholics. The *Catholic Gazette* is an anti-Jesuit organ, recently established. It says : ' We thank God Englishmen are not likely to approve of the Jesuit system of education, and feel the force of the old saying of the man who declared that he "thanked God he was a Catholic, but he also thanked God that he was born and brought up in a Protestant country." Is it not a fact that a certain per-centage of Jesuit-instructed youths invariably go to the bad, and, what is more, are far worse than bad Protestants? We appeal to men of the world for a reply. In France it is notorious that from Voltaire downwards the worst infidels and most immoral men have been ex-Jesuit students.' "

It is this Ultramontane Jesuitism that is at the bottom of the conflict now raging between the Ecclesiastical and the Civil Power all over Europe, and which

* Juvenal, *Satire*, xiv.

the Archbishop is so lugubrious over because the Roman Curia is getting, as in such a conflict it deserves to get, the worst of it. Let it try the same thing here, as it is itching to do, and it will get a lesson that will last it till the crack of doom, if it itself lasts so long.

Liberty of conscience doesn't mean the liberty of a conscience that impels its owner to enslave other consciences.

With the Gallicanism of Pascal and Bossuet and Dupin, of Carroll and Eccleston and Taney, of Beaumont and Norfolk and Camoys, Civil Society has no conflict ; for Gallicanism is consistent with patriotism, but Ultramontaniam abhors the very word, and is doing its best, or rather its worst, to eradicate the name and the thing from the minds and hearts of men. May the curse of Him who "hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, *and the bounds of their habitation,*" * rest upon it.

The following letter, which speaks for itself, and which I give in part, only wishing I had room for the whole, I take from *The Genius of Popery opposed to the Principles of Civil and Religious Liberty*, Dublin, 1850, pp. 176-178 :

" DUBLIN, Nov. 20, 1850.

" MY DEAR LORD ZETLAND : I perceive that the newspapers have announced the intention of the High Sheriff to call a public meeting to consider the propriety of addressing the Crown on the subject of the late insult [the setting up of a Roman Hierarchy in England] offered to this country by the Court of Rome, and I learn from the same sources of information that the step on the part of the High Sheriff has been taken in consequence of a requisition signed by nearly all the resident peers in Yorkshire. It is a matter not only of no

* Acts 17 : 26.

surprise, but of no regret to me, that such a proceeding should be adopted by the country, for the acts in question are of quite as much political and social importance as of religious and sectarian character. The pope, by his ill-advised measures, has placed the Roman Catholics in this country in a position where they must either break with Rome, or violate their allegiance to the constitution of these realms. . . .

It is impossible to act up to the spirit of the British Constitution, and at the same time acknowledge the jurisdiction of the pope in local matters. . . . Believing, therefore, that the late bold and clearly expressed edict of the Court of Rome cannot be received or accepted by English Roman Catholics without a violation of their duties as citizens, I need not add that I consider the line of conduct now adopted by Lord John Russell as that of a true friend of the British Constitution.

“ Believe me, my dear Lord Zetland, yours very truly,

“ BEAUMONT.

“ To the Right Hon. the Earl of Zetland.”

This drew from the Duke of Norfolk the following letter to Lord Beaumont :

“ ARUNDEL CASTLE, Nov. 28, 1850.

“ MY DEAR LORD : I so entirely coincide with the opinion of your letter to Lord Zetland, that I must write to you to express my agreement with you.

“ I should think that many must feel as we do, that ultramontane opinions are totally incompatible with the allegiance to our Sovereign and with our constitution.

“ I remain, my dear Lord, faithfully yours,

“ NORFOLK.”

These letters are from “ representative men” of the

Roman Communion, one of them at the head of the English Nobility. Here is another, from Lord Camoys, called forth by Mr. Gladstone's pamphlet on the new dogma of Papal Infallibility. I give it entire, as I find it in the *Southern Churchman* of December 3d, 1874 :

“ LETTER FROM A ROMAN CATHOLIC NOBLEMAN.

“ The pamphlet of Mr. Gladstone is attracting great attention, not only in England, but in Germany, and in this country. In the *London Times*, Lord Camoys, who is a Roman Catholic, publishes a letter, addressed to Mr. Gladstone, in which he concurs with the views of the pamphlet. It is of so much importance we give it in full :

“ “ HENLEY-ON-THAMES, NOV. 13, 1874.

“ “ DEAR MR. GLADSTONE : In your “ Expostulation ” you have appealed to those English Roman Catholics who concur in the views you have therein expressed. As I am one of those who so concur, I am bound to say so. No one is more entitled than yourself to an expression of confidence from those who have benefited by the great principles of civil and religious liberty by which you have been invariably guided. I concur in the proposition you have stated, though I regret in reference to the reign of Queen Mary you should have considered it necessary to use the term “ bloody.” It is unnecessary to argue upon the accuracy of the expression. That word has always been and is offensive to the Roman Catholics, and was not needed to support your assertion. I believe it to be perfectly true, since that reign it was not possible for the party to whom you allude—I presume the Ritualists—and you might have added for the Roman Catholics, and I add for both combined, though they might tend to overthrow the Established Church, yet could never make

this a Roman Catholic country. Lord Acton and yourself have drawn attention, and quite appropriately, to the language held by the Roman Catholic clergy and laity previous to emancipation, when the distinction between the civil and spiritual duties of Catholics was clearly defined and infallibility emphatically denied. Had any Catholic of importance then said, "I am a Catholic first and an Englishman after," and that without the slightest reservation, and had that expression been defended by a Catholic Archbishop of that day as it has been defended by the Archbishop of Westminster, I very much doubt if Catholic emancipation would have been granted. In noticing your "Expostulation" the Archbishop of Westminster, in his published letter, said that there is no change in the obligations of the Roman Catholics to the civil power in consequence of the publication of the Vatican decrees. Now, is this so? It is not likely the present Pope will adopt against Queen Victoria the course pursued by the then Pope against Queen Elizabeth, but there is no telling what edict might be issued by the author of the Syllabus. Assuming an edict was now issued tending to weaken or destroy allegiance, what a different position a Roman Catholic would be in now from what he would have been in then! Infallibility was not then a matter of compulsory belief, and he would have been at liberty to refuse compliance with such an edict; but what would be the effect of his belief in the personal infallibility? He must either withhold his allegiance on the one hand, or risk his salvation on the other; and is not this a new obligation? To be compelled to believe under severe penalties now what we were at liberty to disbelieve then with impunity is surely a new obligation. As an Independent English Roman Catholic, I consider it my duty to make this response to your appeal. Much may be said of the serious difficulties that many members of the Roman Catholic Church

throughout the world will be placed in by being compelled to believe in the Vatican decrees. For myself, I will say that history, common sense, and my early instruction, forbid me to accept the astounding and novel (novel, at least, in its present promulgation) doctrine of the personal infallibility of the Pope, though limited, as asserted, to the large domain of faith and morals. I remain yours faithfully.

“ ‘ CAMOYS.’ ”

A beautiful illustration this of the Archbishop's glowing apostrophe (p. 90) to the “ Children of the Catholic Church : ” “ You are a part of that universal Communion which has no ‘ High Church ’ and ‘ Low Church ’ . . . Well may you exclaim : *Behold how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity ! ! !* ”

As a pendant to the preceding remarks on Jesuit Colleges and Conventual Schools, I give the following from the *Baltimore Gazette* of December 7th, 1878 :

“ FAILURE OF A CELEBRATED CATHOLIC COLLEGE.
THEATRICAL GOSSIP.

LONDON, NOV. 24.

“ Special Correspondence of the *Gazette*.

“ The Roman Catholic college which was established a few years ago at Kensington has failed, and there is reason to believe that its brief existence will be rung out by next Christmas bells. The failure is softened to the Catholic breast by many theories, the chief being that it was not in the right locality and that it will presently reappear at Oxford. But the real difficulty was that this college could not prepare young men for any degree whatever now given in this kingdom by any university without instructing them in heretical books. The works of Lyell, Darwin, Huxley, Tyndall,

Haeckel, and such men, are used as regular books of study at Oxford, Cambridge, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Dublin, and London; they are not optional, but provided for by the authorities, and no man can pass examinations without them. It is idle for a college to attempt to get on without preparing youth for degrees without which no one can become a physician or a professor and which is becoming the readiest way of succeeding in the law. The Roman Catholic church while steadily gaining fresh strength from one side of the English church, is really out of harmony with the present strong tendency to physical, political and social sciences found in all educational institutions in this country. Their college at Kensington had in it powerful men—St. George Mivart, Mgr. Capel, Cardinal Manning and one or two other highly-cultivated men—but they had been educated as Protestants and seceded from the English church. They did not put forth for their new college any list of books to meet the examinations of the degree-conferring universities. Consequently the youth, even of their own body, who aspire to English careers, could not venture to run risk of wasting their early years by entering there.

“If, indeed, a rumor I have heard but do not credit should prove true and a Roman Catholic college be established at Oxford, it would be in picturesque coincidence with the founding there of a college for women. In that monastic city, where, under its ancient régime the apparition of a pretty girl would, in any moment, have identified her with Satanella, a Catholic college would now find its twin sister in a female college. Your correspondent has the pleasure of belonging to an association just formed which is to meet at Oxford on the 3d of December and found this institution. Many of the most active masters and professors of the university—High Church and Broad—have united to carry through a scheme which began with a lady hav-

ing offered a thousand pounds to start the matter. Next year the lectures and classes which will prepare girls above 18 to pass the regular Oxford examinations, without reserve or limit, will begin. For a time, the girls from a distance, who attend, will be lodged in houses which a committee of ladies will buy and secure. In this the ladies will begin just where the old pilgrim-students did, who lodged where they could and gradually clubbed together in what were called halls (some are so called yet) and afterward grew into the statelier buildings of colleges. . . .”

To the proposed college for women at Oxford every true friend of the higher education will bid a hearty God-speed ; and if the Roman Communion shall establish at that University a college for its sons, that shall keep abreast of the age in secular studies, we will bid that, *so far*, God-speed, also.

A word now on “ Maryland toleration,” and I close this chapter :

“ On the 2d of April, 1649,” says the Archbishop, “ the General Assembly of Maryland passed the following Act, which will reflect unfading glory on that State as long as liberty is cherished in the hearts of men : ‘ Whereas the enforcing of conscience in matters of religion hath frequently fallen out to be of dangerous consequence in those commonwealths where it has been practised, *and for the more quiet and peaceable government of this province and the better to preserve mutual love and unity amongst the inhabitants*, no person whatsoever within this province, professing to believe in Jesus Christ, shall from henceforth be anyways troubled or molested for his or her religion, nor in the free exercise thereof, nor any way compelled to the belief or exercise of any other religion against his or her consent.’ ”

“ Upon this noble statute, Bancroft makes the following candid and judicious comment : ‘ The design of the

law of Maryland was to protect freedom of conscience.
 . . . ” (pp. 231, 232).

As the Archbishop has a way (as the reader has already seen in more than one instance) of omitting from a quotation what makes against him, let me, in the present instance, supply the omission: “Any person or persons whatsoever that shall deny our Saviour Jesus Christ to be the Son of God, or shall deny the Holy Trinity—the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, or the Godhead of any of the three persons of the Holy Trinity or the unity of the Godhead, or shall use any reproachful words, speeches or languages concerning the Holy Trinity, or any of the three said persons thereof, shall be punished with death and confiscation or forfeiture of all his or her land and goods to the Lord Proprietor and his heirs.”

These provisions are part and parcel of the Archbishop’s “noble statute;” and Bancroft’s “comment” on it, whether “candid and judicious,” or not, must be admitted to be at least disinterested, seeing, if the said provisions were now in force and enforced, and he were to buy a house in Baltimore, and take up his residence in it, he would be put to death, and his house, and furniture, and library, would be confiscated; to the reflection of “unfading glory” on the good State of Maryland “as long as,” etc.

The truth is, nothing was further from the intention of any one of the three classes, Anglican, Puritan, Roman, that made up (probably in about equal proportions) the bulk of the population—Quakers and Socinians being only sporadic—than to pass an act of universal (or even general) toleration, *for toleration’s sake*. The Roman portion had sucked in intolerance with their mothers’ milk. So had the grandfathers of the Anglican and the Puritan; and it has taken several generations to get the *virus* out of their blood, if indeed it be entirely out yet. What they were seeking

was, as is plain from the very words of the preamble, especially those I have *italicized*, a *modus vivendi*, a way of getting along comfortably, or, at least, *tolerably*, together, in the peculiar circumstances in which they were placed. Each one was ready to give a grudging toleration to the other two, as the only way of being itself tolerated. And so the Act was passed, tolerating all "professing to believe in Jesus Christ" as "the Son of God," one of "the three persons of the Holy Trinity," and "punishing with death" any one "denying" him to be such.

In the Assembly that enacted this law, there is not the slightest proof, or even probability, that those of the Roman Communion were in the majority. In the rank and file of the population Protestantism was predominant in the beginning. "Lord Baltimore's colony," says a late writer,* "came to Maryland in 1634. It has been commonly assumed that the majority of the settlers were Roman Catholics, but a better knowledge of the facts in the case proves to the contrary. Even Bancroft, who, in the first edition of his history, fell in to the common opinion, in his new and revised edition [which the Archbishop seems not to have seen] says that the majority of the first settlers were Protestants. . . .

* The Rev. B. F. Brown, Rector of St. Paul's Church, Harrisburg, Pa., and formerly Rector of All Saints' Church, Baltimore, to whom I am indebted for the facts here stated, the original sources not being accessible to me as I write. See an article of his in the *New York Church Journal* of August 9, 1877, called forth by a passage in Governor Carroll's Address at the Dedication of the "Catholic Centennial Fountain." See also a pamphlet entitled, *Early Religious History of Maryland. The Substance of a Lecture Delivered before the Guild of All Saints' Church, Baltimore. By the Rev. B. F. Brown, Baltimore; Innes & Co., 1876.* Respecting this, Mr. B. writes me: "Dr. De Peyster, President of the New York Historical Society, and Dr. Hoyt, of the New England Historical and Genealogical Register have done my poor pamphlet the honor to style it a *Demonstration* of its two main points—Maryland not a Roman Catholic Colony—Toleration not an act of Roman Catholic Legislation."

“ In 1645, Richard Ingle, holding a commission from the Parliament, drove Leonard Calvert (Lord Baltimore’s Lieutenant Governor) out of Maryland, and held its Government in the Parliamentary interest for nearly two years. The Jesuit Priests were arrested and sent to England for trial, the Missions were broken up, and the Roman Catholic influence in the Province greatly diminished. . . .

“ In the Province the number of people declined from over six hundred to about four hundred. To save all he had invested in the enterprise, Lord Baltimore had to achieve two things : FIRST, to conciliate the Puritan Government ; and SECONDLY, to bring emigrants to his declining Colony. Departing from his former policy of putting his Roman Catholic friends in the Colonial offices, he appointed one *Capt. Gibbons* of Boston, *a noted Puritan*, to be Admiral of the Province of Maryland. Robert Vaughn, *a Protestant*, was made Commander of Kent Isle ; and Col. *William Stone*, *a Protestant* and Parliament man, to be his Governor in Maryland. Stone’s commission, dated August, 1648, showed that it was on condition that he brought five hundred settlers. . . . Where were the new settlers to come from ? Col. Stone found Virginia to be the most hopeful quarter. Governor Berkeley of that Province had induced the Assembly to enact very rigid laws against the Puritan Nonconformists who had been gathering there. Their uncomfortable position in Virginia disposed them to listen with favor to Stone’s invitation to settle in Maryland. . . .

“ Stone’s promise to the Puritans was embodied in his Commission from Lord Baltimore, and the next year, 1649, enacted by the Maryland Assembly, under the title ‘ An Act concerning Religion,’ and commonly known as ‘ The Religious Toleration Act.’ . . .

“ Hammond, in ‘ Rachel and Leah,’ a pamphlet pub-

lished in England in the year 1656, [after giving an account of their (the Puritans') 'admittance and entertainment into that Province,' and the stipulation 'that they should have a convenient portion of land assigned, the liberty of conscience, and privilege to choose their own officers,' this stipulation being the act (be it observed) of a *Protestant* Governor,] says, 'An Assembly was called throughout the whole country [*i.e.*, Province] *after their coming over, consisting as well of themselves as the rest*, and because there were a few *Papists* that first inhabited, these themselves, and others, being of different judgments, an Act was passed that all professing to believe in Jesus Christ should have equal justice.'

"This passage proves two *essential* things: First, that there were but *few Papists*; and Second, that to the Protestant population, already largely in the ascendant, were added the new Puritan emigrants from Virginia, giving an overwhelming Protestant preponderance in the Assembly of 1649."

Whether any but Protestants voted for the Act may be doubted; for the narrative of Mr. Brown, after some further reflections, proceeds:

"From certain 'Annapolis Manuscripts,' *Neill*, in his new book entitled 'Founders of Maryland,' tells us that in the next year after the Act of 1650, when the Assembly met, and the delegates, thirteen in number, came to be sworn in, *all the Roman Catholics*, four in number—John Medley, Philip Lond, Thomas Matthews, and George Manners—*objected to the principles of the 'Act of Religion.'* Three of them finally took the oath; but Thomas Matthews said *he could not take it, 'as he wished to be guided in matters of conscience by spiritual counsel.'* He was censured and expelled, and Cuthbert Fenwick returned in his place."

Matthews evidently meant, not that he wanted time to consult his spiritual director whether he might, with

a safe conscience, take the oath to maintain the laws, and among them the particular law in question, but, that he had already consulted him, and, as the result of his "spiritual counsel," "*could not take it.*" The other three were of easier virtue. They were opposed, indeed, to the law, *on principle*, but *interest* said to them, with *Meg Merrilies*, "Gape, sinner, and swallow!" So they gaped, and swallowed. But they did it with a wry face. They didn't believe in toleration even as a *modus vivendi*; still less in toleration for toleration's sake; least of all in the inalienable right of freedom of conscience to be (not tolerated but) asserted and maintained against all comers.

After this, and ten times as much more to the same effect, in the article, and the pamphlet, we may well say with the writer of them, in conclusion: "We leave these facts and reflections to an intelligent public, to judge whether the Maryland Assembly of 1649 was Roman Catholic; and whether the 'Act Concerning Religion' was in spirit and intent a 'Broad, True, and Generous Religious Toleration.'"

CHAPTER XVII.

CHARGES OF RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION.

The Spanish Inquisition.—The Massacre of St. Bartholomew.—Queen Mary of England.

I.

"BUT did not the Spanish Inquisition exercise enormous cruelties against heretics and Jews? I am not the apologist of the Spanish Inquisition, and I have no desire to palliate or excuse the excesses into which that tribunal may at times have fallen. . . . When

I denounce the cruelties of the Inquisition, I am not standing aloof from the Church, but I am treading in her footprints. . . . Before you can convict the Church of intolerance, you must bring forward some authentic act of her Popes or Councils sanctioning the policy of vengeance." (pp. 241, 242.)

Very well ! I will attend to that in a moment : but let me first remark that when the Archbishop brings forward, by way of off-set, or "to show," as he expresses it, (p. 243,) that "those who live in glass houses should not throw stones," the persecutions under Calvin, and Luther, and Henry VIII., and the Puritans of New England, and "the religious riots of Philadelphia in 1844," he insults the intelligence of his readers ; for they know, and he knows, that he might put all these together and pile on top of them the fires of Smithfield under "Bloody Mary," and the whole combined would be a heaven of blessedness, compared with the *hell* of the Spanish Inquisition.—Now for acts of Pope and Council.

My first citation shall be from Gieseler, whose *Text-Book of Church History* is recognized among scholars as a *standard authority*, filled, as it is, to repletion, with extracts from the original sources in Greek and Latin. The paragraph I am about to transcribe is backed with authorities in the original Latin occupying eight times as much space as the paragraph itself. I wish I had room for them all, in Latin and English, but must content myself with merely an occasional *reference* to Roman authorities :

"The wretchedness of this country (Toulouse) was completed by the horrors of the Inquisition which now rose up. In order to perpetuate the work of blood, begun by the Papal legates, in a permanent institution, the fourth Lateran Council (in 1215) made it the chief business of the Episcopal Synodal tribunals to search out and punish heretics (c. 3. § 7) ; and the Council of

Toulouse (1229) achieved the organization of this Episcopal Inquisition (Mansi xxiii. 192). However, soon after, it was, in fact, almost annihilated; for in 1232 and 1233 Gregory IX. appointed the Dominicans to be the standing Papal Inquisitors (Bullarium Ord. Prædicat. i. 37; Mansi xxiii. 74; Guil. de Podio Laur. c. 43) and forthwith they began their hideous work in the countries tainted with heresy. In order that the Church may not seem to soil herself with blood, the secular princes must serve the office of executioner.* Lewis IX. in 1228 (*Ordonnances des Roys de France de la zième race* par M. de Laurière, i. 50), Frederick II. in 1232 (*Petri de Vineis* lib. i. ep. 25-27), the ill-fated Raymund VII. in 1233 (Mansi xxiii. 265), each passed the requisite laws. That the new Inquisition might strike more of the guilty, a way of proceeding was prescribed for it, to which of necessity many of the guiltless must fall victims. Thus armed, this monster raged with most frightful fury in southern France, where the heretics had only learned, from former events, to keep themselves more secret. Germany for a short space of time (1231-1233) was taught to know the Inquisition in its most senseless rage, in Conrad of Marburg, and in the Dominican monk Conrad Dorso, who came to Strasburg; and at the same time acquired the most fearful experience of the abuses of the new laws against heretics in the crusade on the Stedinger, the lovers of freedom, in 1234. But by these events so universal a resistance was aroused that Germany for a long time after remained free from this

* This is the answer to what the Archbishop alleges (p. 242) in proof that "Bloodshed and persecution form no part of the creed of the Catholic [meaning the Roman] Church," to wit, that, "So much does she abhor the shedding of blood, that a man becomes disqualified to serve as a minister at her altars, who, by act or counsel, voluntarily sheds the blood of another." She doesn't shed the blood herself, but makes the civil power do it for her. And so she keeps her skirts clean!

monster." (Third Period, § 89. Edit. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1857.)

The new "way of proceeding" spoken of in the last sentence but three, embraced, as explained in a footnote, four particulars: "1. The witnesses were concealed from the accused. . . . 2. Criminals also were admitted as witnesses. . . . 3. Besides, conviction might be effected by such witnesses. . . . 4. Confession was extorted by torture." Each of these statements is followed by the authority on which it rests. In proof of the last, to wit that "confession was extorted by torture," an extract is given, in the original Latin, from the "Bull Ad extirpanda" of Innocent IV., 1252 (Bullar. magn. in Innoc. IV. No. 9), § 25; which, translated into English, runs thus: "Let the Power or Ruler, moreover, be held to compel, short of loss of limb or peril of death, (*teneatur . . . cogere citra membri diminutionem et mortis periculum,*) all heretics whom he shall have taken, to confess expressly their errors, and to accuse other heretics whom they know, and their property, and those who believe them, and receive them, and defend them, as thieves and robbers of temporal things are compelled to accuse their accomplices, and confess the crimes they have committed." How thieves and robbers were "compelled" in those days, we all know; the rack was the recognized instrument of compulsion: and here we have Pope Innocent IV. *commanding* its use against heretics.

Here, then, is one "authentic act" of Pope or Council. Does the Archbishop want another? He shall have it, in the shape of a Letter from Pope Sixtus IV. to Queen Isabella, of Spain, under date of 23 Febr. 1483. "A Pope's letter," says the Archbishop, "is the most weighty authority in the Church." (p. 112.) And the letter of Pope Sixtus must be particularly "weighty," seeing it was by his authorization that the Inquisition was established by Isabella. This is grudg-

ingly admitted by the Archbishop himself: "It is true," he says, "that Sixtus IV., yielding to the importunities of Queen Isabella,* consented to its establishment, being advised that it was necessary for the preservation of order in the kingdom; but in 1481, the year following its introduction, when the Jews complained to him of its severity, the same Pontiff issued a Bull against the Inquisitors, as Prescott informs us, in which 'he rebuked their intemperate zeal, and even threatened them with deprivation.' † He wrote to Ferdinand and Isabella that 'mercy towards the guilty was more pleasing to God than the severity which they were using.' " (p. 252.)

This, of course, couldn't have been the letter of the 23d of February, for that, as given in Gieseler, vol. iii. § 148, n. 8, says: "*Quod autem dubitare videris, nos forsitan existimare, cum in perfidos illos, qui Christianum nomen ementiti Christum blasphemant, et judaica perfidia crucifigunt, quando ad unitatem redigi nequeant, tam severe animadvertere cures, ambitione potius et bonorum temporalium cupiditate (te agi), quam zelo fidei et catholicæ veritatis, vel Dei timore; certo scias, ne ullam quidem apud nos ejus rei fuisse suspicionem. Quod si non defuerint qui ad protegendum eorum scelera multa susurrarint, nihil tamen sinistri de tua vel consortis tui illustris devotione persuaderi nobis potuit,*" *i.e.*, "As to your seeming to doubt whether, perchance, we do not suppose you (to be actuated) rather by ambition and the desire of temporal possessions than by zeal for the faith and Catholic truth, in being so severe against those perfidious ones, who, having belied the Christian name, blaspheme

* Here we have the Archbishop trying to free the Pope from the responsibility and the odium by ungallantly "blaming it on" the Queen!

† Here the Archbishop, by his own witness, fixes the responsibility on the Pope, by showing that he had the power to *deprive* the Inquisitors of their office, and yet didn't do it.

Christ, and with Jewish perfidy crucify him, and cannot be brought back to unity ; know for certain, that not even any suspicion of such a thing has been harbored by us. But if there have not been wanting those who, to cover up their crimes, have whispered many things, yet have they not been able to persuade us of anything sinister concerning your devotedness, or that of your illustrious consort."

Does the Archbishop want yet another "authentic act?" It is at hand. He quotes (pp. 251, 252) *Ranke's Ottoman and Spanish Empires*; I will quote Ranke's *History of the Popes*, Philad., Lea & Blanchard, 1844. "The pope (Paul III.) one day asked cardinal Caraffa [afterwards Paul IV.] 'what means he could devise against these evils?' The cardinal declared that the only one was 'a thorough searching inquisition.' John Alvarez de Toledo, cardinal of Burgos, joined with him in this opinion. . . . On the 21st of July, 1542, the bull was issued. . . .

"It names six cardinals among whom Caraffa and Toledo stood first, to be commissioners of the apostolic see, general and universal inquisitors on this side the Alps and beyond them. It bestows on them the right to delegate ecclesiastics with similar power, to all such places as it shall seem good to them, to determine absolutely all appeals against the acts of the latter, and even to proceed without the participation of the ordinary spiritual courts. Every man, without a single exception, without any regard whatever to station or dignity, shall be subject to their jurisdiction ; the suspected shall be thrown into prison, the guilty shall be punished even capitally, and their property confiscated. . . .

"Caraffa lost not a moment in putting this bull into execution. He was not over rich, but upon this occasion he would have regarded it at (as?) a loss had he waited for a payment from the apostolic chamber :—he

immediately hired a house, fitted up the rooms for officers and the prisons at his own cost; provided them with bars and strong locks, with blocks, chains, and bonds, and all the horrible utensils of his office. He then named commissioners general for the several countries. The first, as far as I can discover, for Rome, was his own chaplain, Teofilo di Tropea, of whose severity, cardinals, such as Pole, had soon reason to complain.

“ ‘The following rules,’ says the MS. biography of Caraffa,* ‘were conceived by the cardinal to be the best directed to the end in view.†

“ ‘1. In matters of faith not a moment’s delay must be made, but upon the least suspicion, measures must immediately be taken with the utmost rigor (*ogni sforzo e violenza*).

“ ‘2. No respect must be shown to any prince or prelate, however high his station.

“ ‘3. Extraordinary and extreme severity must be used against such as shall seek to defend themselves through the protection of any potentate; only whoso confesses, shall be treated mildly and with fatherly compassion.

“ ‘4. We must not debase ourselves to any sort of toleration towards heretics, and especially towards Calvinists.’

“ All, we see, is rigor, unrelenting, unscrupulous rigor, till the confession has been worked out. . . .

“ ‘Everywhere throughout Italy, persecution and terrors broke out. . . .

“ In all these contrivances and undertakings the clergy employed the aid of the secular arm. It was of advantage to the popes that they possessed a territory of their own, of such considerable extent where they

* Caracciolo, Vita di Paolo IV. MS. c. 8.

† Tenuto da lui come assiomi verissimi: *literally*: held by him as most true axioms.

could set an example and establish the model for imitation." (pp. 74-76.)

How Caraffa, after he became pope (Paul IV.) "set" this "example," and "established" this "model," see in Ranke, further on, page 102 :

"Above all other institutions he favored the inquisition which he had himself re-established. He often let pass the days appointed for the sittings of the *segnatura* and the consistory, but never the Thursday on which the congregation of the inquisition *assembled in his presence*. He insisted on the utmost rigor in the proceedings of that body. He subjected new classes of offences to its jurisdiction, *and endowed it with the barbarous prerogative of employing torture* for the detection of accomplices. . . . He *instituted the festival of St. Dominic in honor of that great inquisitor*. . . .

"But the people forgot not so quickly as the pope himself, what they had suffered under him. . . . Upon his death (A.D. 1559) some assembled in the capitol, and resolved to destroy his monuments, since he had been an ill-doer to the city and to the whole earth. *Others pillaged the buildings of the inquisition, set fire to them, and maltreated the servants of the tribunal.*"

Is the Archbishop satisfied with these "authentic acts" of four Popes, Gregory IX., Sixtus IV., Paul III., and Paul IV.; and two Councils, the fourth Lateran Council in 1215, and the Council of Toulouse in 1229? Or would he like to come a little nearer home? Has he forgotten, or does he think *we* have, what came to light, only thirty years ago, in the "one spot of territory" (p. 168) which "the interests of Christianity demand that the Vicar of the Prince of Peace should possess?" Here is a reminder :

"When the pope (Pius IX.) fled from Rome in 1849, he left the inquisition under strict injunctions that every officer should remain at his post, and the prisoners in the holy office to be kept as closely guarded as

before. It was a fortnight after the new government under the Roman Republic was assumed before this was discovered. The government then took possession of all it contained, and ordered the holy office to be made the abode for poor families ; and its doors, which for three centuries had been closed, were for the first time opened to the view of the people. What a scene was there, as the people crowded in to behold the prisons and subterraneous passages which had held so many victims, who had sealed their faith with their blood ! The most terrible oaths and imprecations were made against the priests ; and sometimes the spectators would be intimidated and look behind, fearing even then some father inquisitor might be near to lay hold upon them." (*Pope, or President* : New York, 1859, p. 140.)

"It was about sunset, on the 27th of March, 1849, I was apprised," says a distinguished prisoner, "that something extraordinary was taking place ; and as I expected it would prove to be something dreadful, I fell on my knees, betook myself to prayer, and commended my soul to God. While thus employed my door was violently opened. The first person who entered was a man of short stature, who, with great impetuosity, threw himself on my neck, embracing, kissing, and bathing me with the tears which all the time fell from beneath his green spectacles. This was the Minister Sterbini, the author of the decree which abolished the holy office ; and those who followed him, having embraced me in their turn, he left two of them with me, saying, 'You are free ! I must go and liberate others !'

"I found myself laboring under extreme weakness of the limbs, the effect of my long confinement. It was with great difficulty that I could walk a few steps. The two, therefore, supported me in their arms, and conducted me in triumph to the midst of a crowd

assembled in the court-yard, who, as soon as they saw me, began to shout for joy and clap their hands, exclaiming, 'Liberty of conscience forever!' I was now taken to an apartment, with the other liberated prisoners, where the kind-hearted Roman people, so different from their priests, were eagerly providing broth, wine, and cordials, to recruit our feeble powers. Meanwhile fresh arrivals from the prisons continually took place till we reached the number of about thirty, on which Sterbini, now quite worn out with exertion, asked each one separately where he would like to be conducted. I replied," etc. (F. De Bonne, *L'Italia del Popolo*: in *Pope, or President*, pp. 143, 144.)

Has the Archbishop forgotten, or does he think *we* have, the two Letters that Mr. Gladstone addressed to the Earl of Aberdeen, and the description in them of the chains with which the prisoners of the Inquisition, under the Neapolitan Government, a quarter of a century ago, were fastened two and two?

"The weight of these chains, I understand, is about eight rotoli, or between sixteen and seventeen pounds for the shorter one, which must be doubled when we give each prisoner his half of the longer one. The prisoners had a heavy limping movement, much as if one leg had been shorter than the other. But the refinement of suffering in this case arises from the circumstance that here we have men of education and high feeling chained incessantly together. For no purpose are these chains undone—and the meaning of these last words must be well considered—they are to be taken strictly." (*Pope, or President*, pp. 162, 163.)

Has the Archbishop forgotten the outburst of execration (drawn forth by this revelation of Mr. Gladstone's) from all Christendom (except Pius IX. and his ultramontane minions) that greeted the *miscreant* monarch, (I use the word in its etymological sense—misbeliever, and *therefore* misdoer,) and ultimately drove

him from the throne he had disgraced, to end his days in exile ? Who taught king Bomba to inflict temporal penalties for spiritual delinquencies ? The Council of Trent, whose Fourteenth Canon (Session VII.) Touching Baptism, (as, baldly, I might say servilely, translated by Theodore Alois Buckley from the original Latin now lying before me in the Venice Edition, “Cum Superiorum Licentia et Privilegio,” 1619,) reads thus :

“If any one shall say, that those who have been thus baptized when infants, are, when they have grown up, to be questioned whether they will ratify what their sponsors promised in their name when they were baptized ; and that, in case that they answer they will not, they are to be left to their own will ; and are not meanwhile to be compelled (*cogendos*) to a Christian life by any other penalty, save that they be excluded from the participation of the Eucharist, and of the other sacraments, until they repent ; let him be anathema.”

Here we have the Roman Church, by its mouthpiece the Council of Trent, maintaining that men *are* to be “compelled to a Christian life” by *other than* spiritual penalties, (since, if exclusion from the Eucharist will not compel them to it, no other spiritual penalty will,) —in other words, that men are to be “compelled to a Christian life” by temporal penalties—and coolly cursing all who deny the right of *so* compelling them. That this is the meaning of the Canon the Archbishop must himself admit, or else show (which he never can) that there is some other *spiritual* penalty that will succeed when exclusion from the Eucharist has failed.

But, says the Archbishop, (p. 241,) “in raising my voice against coercion for conscience’ sake, I am expressing not only my own sentiments, but those of every Catholic (he means Roman) Priest and layman in the land.” If so, all I can say is, that they all, with the Archbishop at their head, are so “low-church” (p. 90) that they not only go in the teeth of the four *infalli-*

ble popes, (for the right or wrong of "coercion for conscience' sake" is a question of morals,) and two councils above specified, but distinctly bring themselves under this curse of the Fourteenth Canon of the Seventh Session of the Council of Trent.—And there I leave them.

II.

"What about the massacre of St. Bartholomew?"

Ay, *what* about it? The Archbishop shall tell his story about it first; and then somebody else, who has thoroughly investigated the whole subject, shall tell his.

"I have no words strong enough," says the Archbishop, "to express my detestation of that inhuman slaughter. It is true that the number of its victims has been grossly exaggerated. . . ."

"1. In the reign of Charles IX. of France, the Huguenots were a formidable power and a seditious element in that country. They were under the leadership of Admiral Coligny, who was plotting the overthrow of the ruling monarch. . . ."

"2. Religion had nothing to do with the massacre. Coligny and his fellow Huguenots were slain not on account of their creed, but exclusively on account of their alleged treasonable designs. If they had nothing but their Protestant faith to render them odious to King Charles, they would never have been molested; for neither did Charles nor his mother ever manifest any special zeal for the Catholic Church, nor any special aversion to Protestantism, unless when it threatened the throne.

"3. Immediately after the massacre, Charles despatched an envoy extraordinary to each of the courts of Europe, conveying the startling intelligence that the King and royal family had narrowly escaped from a horrible conspiracy, and that its authors had been de-

tected and summarily punished. The envoys, in their narration, carefully suppressed any allusion to the indiscriminate massacre which had taken place, but announced the event in the following words: On that 'memorable night, by the destruction of a few seditious men, the King had been delivered from immediate danger of death, and the realm from the perpetual terror of civil war.'

"Pope Gregory XIII., to whom also an envoy was sent, acting on this garbled information, ordered a 'Te Deum' to be sung, and a commemorative medal to be struck off in thanksgiving to God, not for the massacre, of which he was utterly ignorant, but for the preservation of the French King from an untimely and violent death, and of the French nation from the horrors of a civil war." (pp. 254-256.)

If this be so, why do the medals, one of which is now lying before me, have on them an angel standing, *with a cross in his uplifted left hand*, and a dagger in his right hand, looking on, while the slaughter is going on before him; and, over all, the legend, V GONOTTORVM. STRAGES; 1572.—Slaughter of the *Huguenots*, 1572? And again; why does the Archbishop say nothing of the frescoes of Vasari in the Vatican, of which more presently? And again; why should the Pope be in such hot haste to commemorate by a medal the "deliverance from immediate danger of death" of a king who "neither did . . . ever manifest any special zeal for the Catholic Church, nor any special aversion to Protestantism?" And yet again; when His Holiness found out the falsehood that had been palmed off on his Infallibility by the French king, why did he not follow the good example that had been set him by Ambrose (p. 228) in the similar case of Theodosius? I say, "palmed off on *his Infallibility*"; for surely, if infallibility is necessary, to prevent a pope from being deceived on the question of the Immaculate Conception,

it is still more necessary, to prevent him from being deceived into giving solemn thanks for an "indiscriminate massacre," an "inhuman slaughter," an "atrocious butchery," (pp. 254, 255,) to the scandal of the said pope and his church now for more than three centuries.

Turn we now to the other picture. I take it from a large octavo volume entitled, "The Massacre of St. Bartholomew : preceded by a History of the Religious Wars in the Reign of Charles IX. By Henry White. With Illustrations. London : John Murray, Albemarle St. 1868." The name of the publisher is a guarantee of the standing of the writer. The italics (except in the Latin) are mine :

"When the news of the massacre reached Rome, the exultation among the clergy knew no bounds. The Cardinal of Lorraine rewarded the messenger with a thousand crowns ; the cannon of St. Angelo thundered forth a joyous salute ; the bells rang out from every steeple ; bonfires turned night into day ; and Gregory XIII. attended by the cardinals and other ecclesiastical dignitaries went in long procession to the church of St. Louis, where the Cardinal of Lorraine chanted a *Te Deum*. *A pompous Latin inscription in gilt letters over the entrance* describes Charles as an avenging angel sent from heaven (*'angelo percussore divinitus immisso'*) to sweep his kingdom *from heretics*.^{*} A medal was struck to commemorate the massacre,[†] and *in the Vatican may still be seen* three frescoes by Vasari[‡] describing the at-

* "Twelve months after the massacre the Cardinal publicly applauded Charles to his face for his 'holy dissimulation.' Dale's dispatch. Mackintosh, Hist. Engl. 3 : 226."

† "It is engraved in Bonanni's *Numismata Pontificum*, 2 vols. fol. Romæ 1689 tom. I, p. 336. It is No. 27 of the series of Gregory XIII. Lestoile mentions it under Lundi 30 juin, 1618, as the *pièce que le pape Grégoire XIII. fit faire à Rome, l'an 1572*."

‡ "The outline of one of the frescoes in the frontispiece to this volume [White's] is taken from De Potter's *Lettres de Pie* 8. It is of the Massacre, and Coligne's body is being cast from a window to be impaled on the spears of assassins below."

tack upon the Admiral, the king in council plotting the massacre, and the massacre itself. Gregory sent Charles the golden rose, *and four months after the massacre*, when humaner feelings might have been supposed to have resumed their sway, *he listened complacently* to the sermon of a French priest, the learned but cankerous Muretus, who spoke of 'that day so full of happiness and joy when the Most Holy Father received the news and went in solemn state to render thanks to God and St. Louis. . . . That night the stars shone with greater lustre, the Seine rolled her waters more proudly to cast into the sea the corpses of those unholy men,' and so on in a strain of rhapsody unendurable by modern ears." (p. 476.)

The Archbishop himself says, "Ranke, in his *History of the Civil Wars*, informs us that Charles and his mother suddenly left Paris in order to avoid an interview with the Pope's legate, *who arrived soon after the massacre*; their guilty conscience fearing, no doubt, a rebuke from the messenger of the Vicar of Christ, *from whom the real facts were not long concealed*." (p. 256.) Of course, he knew these facts long before the "four months" had elapsed, at the *end* of which he "listened *complacently*" to the sermon of the French priest. If, therefore, the guilty conscience of the king feared a rebuke, his fears were groundless. Even the Archbishop doesn't pretend that the Pope ever *did* rebuke him.

III.

"I am asked: *Must you not admit that Mary, Queen of England, persecuted the Protestants of the British realm?* . . .

"If we weigh in the scales of impartial justice the reign of both sisters, we shall be compelled to bring a far more severe verdict against Elizabeth." (p. 257.)

Let us see if this is so. The subject of this chapter, recollect, is "Religious Persecution." Now, at the time we are speaking of, the *stake* was the recognized instrument of death for *heresy*; the *gibbet*, for *treason*. The simple fact, therefore, that Mary's victims perished by the stake, Elizabeth's by the gibbet,* tells the whole story. No doubt the religion of the greater part of those who suffered under Elizabeth, was at the bottom of their sufferings; but then it was because their religion led them into overt acts of treason. Pope Pius V. excommunicated the Queen, and absolved her subjects from their allegiance to her. It was impossible, therefore, for them to be at the same time loyal to the Pope, and loyal to the excommunicated Queen. They had to choose between the two, and to take the consequences of their choice. Such being the case, it is decidedly cool in the Archbishop to cry out (p. 257) against "the legalized fines, confiscations, and deaths inflicted on the Catholics (*ultramontanes*, he means) of Great Britain and Ireland for three hundred years," down "to the time of Catholic Emancipation." It was Pius V. and his successors, not Queen Elizabeth and hers, that brought these penalties upon them. Let Leo XIII., or any of his successors, undertake to play the same game here, and we'll make shorter work than Queen Elizabeth did, of those who attempt to carry out his behests.

* The Archbishop practically admits this in the sentence with which he winds up his chapter: "How many are found, like our North Carolina gentleman, who are familiar from their childhood with the name of *Smithfield*, but who never once heard of *Tyburn*!"—Tyburn, as everybody knows, was the place of the *gibbet*; Smithfield, of the *stake*.

CHAPTER XVIII.

GRACE—THE SACRAMENTS—ORIGINAL SIN—BAPTISM—
ITS NECESSITY—ITS EFFECTS—MANNER OF BAPTIZ-
ING.

THE Archbishop, after defining the grace of God as “that supernatural assistance which He imparts to us through the merits of Jesus Christ, for our salvation,” proceeds to the consideration of the Sacraments. “Three things are necessary,” he says, “to constitute a Sacrament, viz. : a visible sign, invisible grace, and the institution by our Lord Jesus Christ.” The Catechism of the Council of Trent, instead of “visible sign,” uses the phrase, “sensible thing;” and this sensible thing, it tells us, consists of two parts, the “matter” and “the form;” water being the “matter,” in Baptism, for instance, and the words, “I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost,” the “form.”

“Our Saviour instituted seven Sacraments,” continues the Archbishop, “namely, Baptism, Confirmation, Eucharist, Penance, Extreme Unction, Orders, and Matrimony.” (p. 261.)

Whether all these are Sacraments, *in the sense above defined*, we shall see when we come to consider them severally. Meanwhile, I shall content myself with challenging the Archbishop to produce a single passage—only *one*—from the genuine writings of any of the Fathers, for the first one thousand years after Christ, fixing the number of the Sacraments to *seven*. Peter Lombard, in the 12th century, must be allowed that honor; at least, till *chapter and verse* of some earlier writer are *specified*.

That Baptism and the Eucharist are *the* Sacraments

of the Gospel, is clear from the language of St. Chrysostom (*Hom. in Johann.* 85): "*came there out blood and water . . . out of both these* (ἐξ ἀμφοτέρων ταύτων) the Church is constituted: those initiated into it are born by (διὰ) water, nourished by blood and flesh: in these, the mysteries (sacraments) have their source."

Baptism is "for the remission of sins" (Acts 2 : 38); for "washing them away" (Acts 22 : 16). Hence baptism is for all, inasmuch as all are sinners. "These texts," (Rom. 5 : 12; Eph. 2 : 3; Job, 14 : 4; Ps. 51 : 5,) says the Archbishop, (p. 263), "apply to every member of the human family, to the infant of a day old as well as to the adult. . . . The [Roman] Church, however, declares that the Blessed Virgin Mary was exempted from the stain of Original sin," and, in doing so, declares what isn't true; what she herself, at the opening of this nineteenth century, according to the testimony of the Archbishop's predecessor Kenrick's own witness, Milner, didn't *know* to be true; for he says (I have quoted it once, p. 175, and it will bear quoting again): "The church does not decide the controversy concerning the conception of the Blessed Virgin, and several other disputed points, because she sees nothing absolutely clear and certain concerning them, either in the written or the unwritten Word"!!

But enough of this for the present; I shall have more to say on it before I get through.

The greater part of this chapter is taken up with the controversy between the Archbishop and his "Baptist friend," as he terms him; and I leave them to settle it between them. There are but two points that call for notice from me,—the state of infants dying unbaptized,—and the declaration of our Bishops in regard to Baptism.

"Original sin, as St. Paul has told us, is universal. Every child is, therefore, defiled at its birth with the taint of Adam's disobedience. Now the Scripture says

that nothing defiled can enter the kingdom of heaven (Rev. 21 : 27). Hence, Baptism, which washes away original sin is as essential for the infant as for the full grown man, in order to attain the kingdom of heaven.

"I said that Regeneration is necessary for all. But it is important to observe that if a man is heartily sorry for his sins, and loves God with his whole heart, and desires to comply with all the divine ordinances, including Baptism, but has no opportunity of receiving it, *or is not sufficiently instructed as to its necessity*,* God, in this case, accepts the will for the deed. Should this man die in these dispositions, he is saved by the *baptism of desire*. † . . .

"But is not that a cruel and heartless doctrine which excludes from heaven so many harmless babes that have never committed any actual fault? To this I reply : Has not God declared that Baptism is necessary for all?" (p. 268.)

To this I reply : If "Baptism is necessary for all," how is it that the "all" has an exception in the case of adults, but no exception in the case of infants? According to the Archbishop, the Quaker mother who has failed of baptism solely from not being "sufficiently instructed as to its necessity," dying, goes to heaven ; but the Quaker infant, or the Baptist infant, who has failed of baptism solely from its mother's (or, it may be, its father's) not being "sufficiently instructed as to its necessity," dying, goes—where? Not to heaven ; for, says the Archbishop, "the [Roman] Church in obedience to God's Word, (?) declares that unbaptized infants are excluded from the kingdom of heaven."—Where then? The Archbishop shall answer :

"All that the [Roman] Church holds on this point, is that unregenerate [*i.e.*, unbaptized] children are de-

* Italics mine.

† Italics his.

prived of the beatific vision, or the possession of God' which constitutes the essential happiness of the blessed. (p. 270.)

They are "deprived of . . . the essential happiness of the blessed." That's "all"! *Only* that, and nothing more!

"Now, between the supreme bliss of heaven," continues the Archbishop, "and the torments of the reprobate, there is a very wide margin."

Somewhere, then, in this "margin," in the *limbus infantum*, or limbo of infants, Christian mother, your unbaptized child (dying, perhaps, before it was possible to baptize it) may be. You may go to heaven yourself; but of one thing be assured: if the Archbishop, and his Church, are to be depended on, you will never see your child again.

And all this "horrible teaching" of the Roman Church, that *dura mater infantum*, we are told, (p. 269,) is "in obedience to God's Word"! If so, the obedience doesn't go far enough; for "God's Word" says expressly (St. Mark 16:16), "He that believeth not shall be damned." The Roman Church, therefore, to be consistent, should "consign" *all* infants, baptized, as well as unbaptized, "to the place of the reprobate," as the Archbishop (p. 269) euphemistically terms it. A single sentence of the Archbishop's own, further on, (p. 350,) "God's ordinances bind only such as are able to fulfil them," knocks in the head his whole teaching concerning unbaptized infants.

"From what has been said, I ask you candidly what are you to think of the decision rendered in 1872 (1871) by the Bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church, who, in their convention in Baltimore, declared that by the word *Regeneration* we are not to understand a *moral change*. If no moral change is effected by Baptism, then there is no change at all; for, certainly Baptism produces no physical change in the soul." (p. 274.)

There was no "decision" rendered ; it was simply an expression of "opinion" on the part of the Bishops that "the word 'Regenerate' is not there [namely, in the Baptismal Office] so used as to determine that a moral change in the subject of baptism is wrought in the sacrament."

According to the Archbishop, the only alternative to a "physical change" in Baptism (which no one holds to) is a moral change : the distinction between a spiritual and a moral change, which is one of the common-places of theology, seems not even to have entered into his imagination. Evidently, there has been a very serious defect in his theological training, or else his memory didn't here stand him in stead. Says Bishop Browne (*Exposition of the XXXIX. Articles*, Art. XXVII. p. 622, Amer. Edit.): "Undoubtedly, baptism guarantees a *spiritual change* in the condition of the recipient. But we must not confound a spiritual change in the condition of the soul, with a moral change of the disposition and tempers. It is a great *spiritual* change to be received into Christ's Church, to be counted as a child of God, to obtain remission of sins, and to have the aid and presence [indwelling] of the Spirit of God. But a *moral* change can only be the result of the soul's profiting by the spiritual change."

Baptism is the Sacrament of our *birth* out of the kingdom of nature into the kingdom of grace ; and this birth is a *spiritual* birth. But birth is not the beginning of life. There is life before birth in the spiritual as well as in the natural world. We are "begotten of God ;" (1 St. John 5 : 18 ;) we are "born of Water and Spirit," ἐξ ὕδατος καὶ πνεύματος, (St. John 3 : 5). Birth—in other words, being born, *i.e.*, borne, *i.e.*, brought forth—is the introduction to a new phase of existence, new surroundings, new possibilities (so far as those surroundings are concerned) of development.—Some of these possibilities become, *at once*, actualities ; breath-

ing (for instance) the air of earth—the air of heaven ; others, *after a time* ; digesting (for instance) and assimilating “strong meat.” In either case, the breathing is automatic ; but the suppression of it is voluntary, and, if persisted in, will, in the end, result in death.—See *Birth and New Birth*, Second Edition, (Baltimore, Geo. Lycett, 1873,) from which the last three sentences are taken, and where I have treated the whole subject at large.

Baptism is the Sacrament of our *adoption* into the family of Christ, and this adoption is a *spiritual* adoption. “*Because ye are sons*, God hath sent forth the Spirit of his Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father.” (Gal. 4 : 6.) “Ye have received the Spirit of *adoption*, whereby we cry, Abba, Father.” (Rom. 8 : 15.) Hence, says Clement of Alexandria, (Pæd. lib. i. c. 12). “Being baptized, we are illuminated ; being illuminated, we are adopted as sons ;” and Cyril of Jerusalem, (*Catech. Præfat.* 10,) calls baptism *νιοθεσία: χάρισμα*, *the free gift of adoption*.” Now the effect of *spiritual* adoption may be illustrated by that of *natural* adoption. “Moses was ‘a new creature,’ as to things temporal, the moment he was taken from the ‘ark of bulrushes’ by command of Pharaoh’s daughter : the moment before, he was a slave, under sentence of death ; the moment after, he was a freeman, the heir of royalty. [There was no *moral* change wrought in him, at the time, and by the act, of the adoption ; but] there was then and there given him the power of a new life in the temporal sphere, and, being trained to ‘lead the rest of his life according to this *beginning*,’ he grew into it, becoming, day by day, more and more a new creature, another man than ‘his brethren the children of Israel ;’ they, ignorant slaves ; he, ‘learned in all the wisdom of the Egyptians.’ And as with the infant Moses in the temporal sphere, so with the infant ‘member of Christ’ in the spiritual sphere : he comes from the water ‘a new creature ;’ the power of a new life is

his ; and with the proper care, (not without it, any more than Moses would have done,) he will grow into that life more and more, through daily renewal, (' the inward man is *renewed day by day*,' 2 Cor. 4 : 16,) ' unto a perfect man, (Eph. 4 : 13,) unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ.' "—*Birth and New Birth*, p. 59.

Baptism is the Sacrament of our *engrafting* into Christ. We "by baptism," says the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, (p. 172,) "are engrafted as branches on Christ." According to the Archbishop, the engrafting *creates* the life ; but he will find no nurseryman to agree with him. "'Regenerate, and grafted into the body of Christ's Church.' The Baptismal Office associates the two. As there must be life before birth, other than still-birth, so must there be life before ingraftation. Who would graft a dead scion, knowing it to be dead, on a living stock ? The life that is in the scion of the stock of the First Adam, before its ingraftation into the stock of the Second Adam, is in it in virtue of the Incarnation. The mere act of ingrafting cannot give life. There is nothing magical in it. It makes no change in the nature or character of the scion. It simply [*conditions* a change ; it] places it amid new surroundings, and *as the consequence of those surroundings*, obstacles and hinderances apart, the life of the stock flows into it, and the two grow together (σύνμυτοι, Rom. 6 : 5,) and become one. 'I live,' says the Apostle, (Gal. 2 : 20,) 'yet not I, but Christ liveth in me.' "—*Birth and New Birth*, p. 22.

CHAPTER XIX.

CONFIRMATION.

"CONFIRMATION," says the Archbishop, "is a Sacrament." If so, what is the "matter" of it ? For,

says the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, (p. 139,) "every Sacrament consists of two things:" the "matter," and the "form." What, I say, is the "matter" of Confirmation? The "chrism," *i.e.*, "ointment," says the *Catechism*, (p. 184;) the "chrism," echoes the Archbishop. But, unfortunately for his case, the echo doesn't reach back to the Apostolic age. The first writer who mentions the ointment, is Tertullian, who wrote at the end of the second and beginning of the third century. There is no hint of it in any earlier writer. The Archbishop thinks (p. 278) he finds mention of it in 2 Cor. 1 : 21, 22 : "He that confirmeth (in our Version, "stablisheth") us with you in Christ, and that hath annointed us, is God; who also hath sealed us, and given the pledge of the Spirit in our hearts." But it is enough to reply to this, that if the *anointing* is literal, the *sealing* must be also; as when we *impress* a seal on wax, or on paper, and thereby make a permanent visible mark; which the Archbishop, I presume, will hardly maintain. If Christians were *so* sealed, everybody would know who were Christians and who were not. The *Catechism of the Council of Trent* goes further back than the Archbishop, even to our Lord himself: "The chrism," it says, (p. 185,) "is consecrated with solemn ceremonies, by the bishop. That this its solemn consecration is in accordance with the instructions of our Lord, when at his last supper he committed to his Apostles the manner of making chrism, [to wit, by mixing "oil and balsam," and "solemnly consecrating them by episcopal benediction," *Catechism*, p. 185,] we learn from Pope Fabian." Of course, "Pope Fabian" was there, and heard our Lord give the instructions? Well, no! not quite that; there's a "little space" between them; a matter of some two hundred and three years, or so, between them: for Fabian was Pope from 236 to 250. And this is what passes for *evidence* in the Roman Church! And

even this is forged. There is not now extant, and has not been for nearly fifteen hundred years, any genuine writing of any Pope, except Clement, prior to Siricius, A.D. 384. All those pretended letters of the early popes had been proved to be spurious before the publication of the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*. The Catechism ought, therefore, to be ashamed of itself for attempting to father such ineffably silly stuff upon Pope Fabian, who was a man of sense, and, as the Catechism truly says, "eminently distinguished by his sanctity, and by the glory of martyrdom."

"The Episcopal Church retains, indeed, the name of Confirmation in its ritual, and even borrows a portion of our prayers and ceremonial." (p. 283.)

She borrows some ; but not from you. She borrows only those that you yourself borrowed, also, from those that went before you ; those that are really yours she would be the very last to borrow. Moreover, she "retains" not only "the name of Confirmation," but the *thing*, just as it is laid down by the Apostle (Heb. 6 : 1, 2) as one of the six "principles of the doctrine of Christ"—the "laying on of hands," or, as the Archbishop's Version calls it, in its latinized English, "imposition * of hands ;" no "anointing" here ; just as it was practised by St. Peter and St. John, (Acts 8 : 14-17), and by St. Paul (Acts 19 : 6).

"In violation of the practice of all antiquity, it mutilates the rite by omitting the sacred unction." (p. 283.)

"All antiquity" goes back of Tertullian, the Archbishop's earliest witness, one hundred and fifty years, and during all those years there is not, as the Archbishop very well knows, a syllable of any literal anointing in Confirmation.

* Not the only "imposition" in the Roman Church ; for, as *Father Tom* says, "Imposthor," *id est*, "imposithor : " for isn't the Pope "the grand imposithor and top-sawyer of Christendom ?" That word, "top-sawyer," is good : the bottom-sawyer is down in the saw-pit, and gets all the dust in his eyes ; the Pope looks out not to let any one throw dust in his,

“ It raises, indeed, its hands over the candidates ; but they are not the anointed hands of Peter or John.” (p. 283.)

“ No ; for the hands of Peter and John were not anointed, except—as are those of our Bishops, at least to as great an extent as are those of the Bishops of the Roman Church—“ with the Holy Ghost and with power.”

CHAPTER XX.

THE HOLY EUCHARIST.

“ AMONG the various dogmas of the Catholic Church,” says the Archbishop, (p. 284,) there is none which rests on stronger Scriptural authority than the doctrine of the Real Presence of Jesus Christ in the Holy Eucharist.”

In this, I am happy to agree with him ; that is, in what he *says* : if he means what he doesn't say, that is his fault, not mine.

In his “ exposition and vindication ” of the doctrine, he proposes to speak of “ the promise of the Eucharist,” of “ its institution ” and of “ its use among the faithful.” The first of these he finds in the discourse of our Lord at Capernaum, (recorded in the sixth chapter of St. John,) in which he considers Him as “ speaking of the Sacrament of his body and blood.” But it is certain that his hearers could not have so understood him. The truth is, He is speaking not of the Sacrament but of that which underlies the Sacrament. As the Presbyterian commentator David Brown excellently expresses it : “ Although this discourse has nothing to do with the Sacrament of the Supper, the Sacrament has everything to do with it, as the visible embodiment of these figures, and, to the believing par-

taker, a *real*, yea, and the most lively and affecting participation of His flesh and blood, and nourishment thereby of the spiritual and eternal life, here below."

The Archbishop argues from verses 48-56, 61, and 67, not only that our Lord's hearers understood His words *literally*, about eating His flesh and drinking His blood, but that He meant they should; else He would have corrected their misapprehension of them, as He did in other instances,—that, for instance of "the leaven of the Pharisees," which, when they mistakenly interpreted it of *bread*, He explained as referring to the *doctrine* of the Pharisees. Now it so happens that our Lord *did* correct their misapprehension, in this very discourse; and St. John, who recorded the misapprehension, has recorded also the correction of it; and here it is, right under the Archbishop's nose, though he doesn't see it; none so blind as those that won't see:

"Many therefore of his disciples, when they had heard this (about eating His flesh and drinking His blood), said, This is an hard saying; who can hear it? When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it, he said unto them, Doth this offend you? What and if ye shall see the Son of man ascend up where he was before? It is the spirit that quickeneth; the flesh profiteth nothing: the words that I speak unto you, they are spirit, and they are life." (verses 60-63.) As if he had said, When you shall see the body of the Son of man ascend up into heaven, then you will know that it is not here for you to eat; and that therefore when I speak of eating it here, I speak of a heavenly, not an earthly, eating; of a spiritual, not a carnal, literal, manducation. The Archbishop, with the vail of Roman (more carnal even than Jewish) tradition upon his heart, "untaken away (2 Cor. 3: 14, 15) in the reading of the *New Testament*," sticks fast in the letter, that killeth, and fails to penetrate to the

spirit, that giveth life. *Qui hæret in litera, hæret in cortice.* So Origen, who is one of the authorities that he himself quotes, could teach him. For, in his Seventh Homily on Leviticus, referring to this very discourse of our Lord, he says: "Non solum in veteri Testamento occidens litera deprehenditur; est in novo Testamento litera quæ occidat eum qui non spiritualiter quæ dicuntur adverterit. Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc ipsum quod dictum est: *Nisi manducaveritis carnem meam, et biberitis sanguinem meum, occidit litera:*" i.e., "Not only in the old Testament is there a letter which killeth; but also in the new Testament there is a letter which killeth him who does not spiritually consider it. For, if according to the letter [like the Archbishop] you receive this saying, *Except ye eat My Flesh and drink My Blood*, that letter killeth."

The Archbishop next proceeds to "the words of the Institution." "Could any idea," he asks, "be expressed in clearer terms than these: This is My body; this is My blood?" Certainly it could, if the Archbishop's interpretation is the true one; for, had our Lord meant what the Archbishop says He meant, He could, *and would*, have said, "This is no longer bread, but is *transubstantiated* into the *substance* of my body; what remains, is only the *accidents* of the bread, and it is these that you see and taste: the *substance* of the bread is gone, and in its place is come, in virtue of the words of consecration, the *substance* of my body." Had He said this (supposing this to be His meaning, that is,) His words would have been *a great deal* plainer than they are; *so* plain, indeed, that they could not possibly have been misunderstood, any more than the Roman doctrine can be. But our Lord took it for granted that his disciples, being men of common sense, would not dream that he meant by *This is my body*, this is *transubstantiated* into my body; any more than those who should come after them, sixty years later, would

dream that one of them, saying, (Rev. 1 : 20,) "The seven candlesticks . . . are the seven churches," would mean that each candlestick was transubstantiated into a church : for certainly if the *wording* of the sentence proves transubstantiation in the one case, it proves it in the other.

The Roman Church, by her doctrine of transubstantiation, exacts of her communicants what a Saint of her own Calendar,—St. Augustine, characterizes as criminal and disgraceful. In the third book of his treatise *De Doctrina Christiana*, he has a short chapter, the sixteenth, headed, *Regula de locutionibus præceptivis*, that is, "Rule concerning preceptive utterances," which begins thus :

Si præceptiva locutio est aut flagitium aut facinus vetans, aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam jubens, non est figurata. Si autem flagitium aut facinus videtur jubere aut utilitatem aut beneficentiam vetare, figurata est. *Nisi manducaveritis, inquit, carnem filii hominis, et sanguinem biberitis, non habebitis vitam in vobis* (Joan. vi. 54). Facinus vel flagitium videtur jubere : figura est ergo, præcipiens passioni dominicæ communicandum, et suaviter atque utiliter recondendum in memoria quod pro nobis caro ejus crucifixa et vulnerata sit : *i.e.*, "If there is a precept forbidding something disgraceful or criminal, or commanding something useful or beneficent, the precept is not figurative. But if it seems to require that which is disgraceful or criminal, or to prohibit that which is useful or beneficent, it is figurative. *Except ye eat, He says, the flesh of the Son of man, and drink his blood, ye have no life in you.* He seems to require that which is criminal or disgraceful ; therefore his language is a figure, bidding us communicate in the Passion of our Lord, and sweetly and to our profit lay up in our memory the thought that for us His Flesh was crucified and wounded."

But, says the Archbishop, (p. 292,) "every circum-

stance connected with the delivery of them [the words, This is my body, etc.] obliges us to interpret them in their plain and literal acceptation. . . . He was addressing His few chosen disciples, to whom He promised to speak in future, not in parables nor in obscure language, but in the words of simple truth."

When did He promise this? *After* the Last Supper, and immediately before His betrayal and arrest. And when was the promise to take effect? Not till His Ascension and Session in glory at the right hand of the Father: "The time cometh"—it had not yet come—"when I shall no more speak unto you in proverbs, but I shall show you plainly of the Father. *At that day*, ye shall ask in my name," etc. (St. John 16 : 25, 26.)

"He uttered these words," continues the Archbishop, "the night before His Passion. And when will a person use plainer speech than at the point of death?"

He was *nearer* "the point of death" when He uttered the words, (St. John 15 : 1,) "I am the true vine," etc., and therefore, *a fortiori*, according to the Archbishop's reasoning, must His words be taken "in their plain and literal acceptation;" and so we must understand Him to mean that He was a literal vine! The Archbishop should look to his chronology. He serves the different parts of Scripture, as he says (p. 174) Tristram Shandy did the "*cursing and damning*,"—"heaps them up in wild confusion."

The Archbishop next quotes from St. Paul; (1 Cor. x. and xi. ;) but the language is clearly against him. The Apostle says expressly, "Whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily, *shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord.*" And, "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh condemnation to himself, *not discerning the Lord's body.*" "How could he be blamed," says the Archbishop, "for not discerning the body of the Lord if

there were only bread and wine before him?" Nobody says there were *only* bread and wine; but the Archbishop says there were no bread and wine at all; thereby contradicting the Apostle, who condemns the unworthy partaker, because in eating the "*bread*,"—mark that; it is *bread* that he eats,—in eating the "*bread*," he fails to "*discern the Lord's body*."

But, says the Archbishop, (p. 295,) "if the words of St. Paul are figuratively understood, they are distorted, forced, and exaggerated terms, without meaning or truth. But if they are taken literally, they are full of sense and of awful significance." Why doesn't the Archbishop himself take them literally then? He talks about *wine*, but the word "*wine*" is never once used by the Apostle in the passages the Archbishop quotes from him; it is *cup* (or *chalice*) throughout: "the *cup* of blessing, which we bless"—"this *cup* is the New Testament (or Covenant)"—"as often as ye eat this bread and drink this *cup*"—"and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that *cup*." Either let the Archbishop admit that, if there is any transubstantiation at all, it is the *cup*, and not the wine in it, that is transubstantiated, or else let him stop talking of *his* being the *literal* interpretation.

The Archbishop now passes from the Scriptures to the Fathers, who, he says, "without an exception, re-echo the language of the Apostle of the Gentiles." He is right; they do re-echo it. The Apostle says, as we have just seen, "Whosoever shall eat this *bread*;" and the Fathers say the same. They all call the bread and wine the body and blood of Christ, just as the Archbishop does, and just as we do: there is no dispute between us on that point. The bread and wine *are* the body and blood of Christ. But *how*? literally, or figuratively? Literally, says the Archbishop. Figuratively, say the Fathers, and say we. They *are* the body and blood of Christ, and yet remain bread and wine;

just as "the seven candlesticks" (Rev. 1 : 20) "*are* the seven churches." St. John makes this declaration in explanation of *το μυστήριον*, the "mystery," as we and the Archbishop's Version translate it, the "sacrament," as the Rhemish Version renders it, "of the seven candlesticks." The Rhemish Version teaches, therefore, that the seven candlesticks are *sacramentally* the seven churches. Just so, we affirm, the bread and wine are *sacramentally* the body and blood of Christ. The two declarations are, in this respect, perfectly parallel.

The Archbishop gives what purport to be quotations from Ignatius, Justin Martyr, Origen, Cyril of Jerusalem, Chrysostom, and Augustine ; but instead of giving chapter and verse for each, as is the scholarly way, he gives for all six only the wholesale reference, "See Faith of Catholics, Vol. II.," a work in at least three volumes (for he quotes, further on, from Vol. III.), which probably not one in a thousand of his readers ever saw or ever will see. As it is not accessible to me as I write, I must get along as well as I can without it. As the works of Ignatius and Justin are brief, the former of them occupying less than fifty pages, the latter less than seventy, I have succeeded, by diligent search, in finding the two passages. That from Ignatius is correctly quoted. In it he affirms the Eucharist to be "the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ ;" but whether literally, or figuratively, he does not say, either here, or in any other part of his writings. We must, therefore, interpret him by the others ; if we find that they are to be taken literally, then he is to be taken literally ; if, on the other hand, they are to be taken figuratively, then he is to be taken figuratively.

The passage from Justin Martyr is outrageously garbled ; but whether by the Archbishop, or by the author of *The Faith of Catholics*, I do not know. I should take it for granted that it was not by the Arch-

bishop, had I not already (p. 114) detected him in a precisely similar garbling of Holy Scripture. I give the passage entire, putting in *italics* the part left out by the Archbishop :

“ For we receive not these elements as common bread or common drink. But even as Jesus Christ our Saviour, being made flesh by the Word of God, had both flesh and blood for our salvation, even so we are taught, that the food which is blessed by the prayer of the word which came from him, *by the conversion of which* (into our bodily substance) *our blood and flesh are nourished*, ἐξ ἧς αἷμα καὶ σάρκες κατὰ μεταβολὴν τρέφονται ἡμῶν, is the flesh and blood of that Jesus who was made flesh.” *Apol.* i. c. 86.

I have given this extract, in the translation of Chevalier, edited by Bishop Whittingham. The four words in parenthesis are supplied by the translator, but any Greek scholar can see that they are implied in the original Greek of the italicized portion, which I have also given. But let us leave out these words, and translate the Greek literally, thus : “ *by* (ἐξ, *out of the substance of*) *which our blood and flesh by digestion* (‘ μεταβάλλεσθαι τροφήν, to digest one’s food,’ Liddell and Scott) *are nourished.*” Why these words were left out, it needs no ghost to tell. In them, Justin declares that by the (no longer common, but) consecrated bread and wine our blood and flesh are, by digestion, nourished ; and therefore, by clear implication, (since accidents can’t nourish substance,) that the natural substance of the bread and wine remain after consecration. This the Archbishop, or whoever was the *responsible* party, was shrewd enough to see ; and so, inasmuch as, with the words left in, Justin wouldn’t even seem to teach transubstantiation, they were quietly left out. Were this the only omission of the kind, it might possibly, by a stretch of charity, be put to the account of accident ; but I have already exposed more than one, of the same

kind, and others are to follow. To suppose all these, —*all tending in one direction, all converging to one end*—the result of accident, is to insult the commonest intelligence.

So much for the Archbishop's second extract. The remaining four I have no means of testing, as he disdains to give chapter and verse, and I cannot undertake to search for them through twenty huge folio volumes. They may be correct, but the reader is warranted, by what he has already seen, in looking upon them with suspicion. But whether correct or incorrect, they do not teach transubstantiation. Origen, *as quoted by the Archbishop*, (p. 296,) says: "If thou wilt go up with Christ to celebrate the Passover, He will give to thee that bread of benediction, His own body, and will vouchsafe to thee His own blood." And St. Augustine, *as quoted by the Archbishop*, (p. 297,) says: "You ought to know what you have received. The bread which you see on the altar, after being sanctified by the word of God, is the body of Christ. That chalice, after being sanctified by the word of God, is the blood of Christ." That is what *we* say. That is what our Lord Himself says: *This is my body; this is my blood.* There is no dispute on this point. The point in dispute is, as the Archbishop very well knows, *How* are they his body and blood? Literally, or figuratively? Literally, says the Archbishop. Figuratively, say Origen and Augustine, as we have already seen (above, pp. 288, 289), Augustine going so far as to say that to take the words literally would be to represent our Lord as requiring of us what would be "*criminal and disgraceful.*" And yet the Archbishop, knowing this, or else being (for a high dignitary) discredibly ignorant, coolly tries to palm him off on us as an asserter of transubstantiation!

Of the two remaining witnesses of the Archbishop, St. Chrysostom, *as he quotes him*, says: "If thou wert

indeed incorporeal, He would have delivered to thee those same incorporeal gifts without covering. But since the soul is united to the body, He delivers to thee in things perceptible to the senses, the things to be apprehended by the understanding. How many nowadays say : ' Would that we could look upon His (Jesus') form, His figure, His raiment, His shoes.' Lo ! thou seest Him, touchest Him, eatest Him."—But *how* do we, according to St. Chrysostom, see Him, touch Him, eat Him ? By the " understanding," as contradistinguished from the " senses." The " things to be apprehended by the understanding" are the body and blood of our Lord ; and these, St. Chrysostom says, are " delivered" to us " in things perceptible to the senses," namely, in the bread and wine.—This is in exact accordance with his teaching elsewhere. Commenting on St. John 6 : 63, (Hom. xlvii. 3,) he says : " He (Christ) tries to remove their difficulties in another way, as follows, *It is the spirit that quickeneth, the flesh profiteth nothing*: that is to say, You ought to understand My words in a spiritual sense : he who understands them carnally is profited nothing. To interpret carnally is to take a proposition in its bare literal meaning, and allow no other [which is just what the Archbishop does]. But we should not judge of mysteries in this way ; but examine them with the inward eye ; *i.e.*, understand them spiritually." And again (Hom. xxv., on St. John 3) : " As in baptism, the spiritual power of regeneration is given to the material water ; so also the immaterial [incorporeal] gift of the body and blood of Christ is not received by any sensible corporal action, but by the spiritual discernment of our faith, and of our hearts and minds." According to the Archbishop, the body of Christ is placed by the priest on the tongue of the communicant, (which is a " sensible corporal action,") and is swallowed by the communicant, (which is another sensible corporal action :)

plainly the Archbishop and the golden-mouthed Father are heaven-wide from each other.

The only remaining witness cited by the Archbishop is St. Cyril, of Jerusalem, who, *as he quotes him*, says : " He Himself having declared, *This is my body*, who shall dare to doubt henceforward ? and he having said, *This is my blood*, who shall ever doubt, saying : This is not his blood ? He once at Cana turned water into wine, which is akin to blood ; and is He undeserving of belief, when He turned wine into blood ? " The question is *how* He turns wine into blood. Does He turn wine into blood in the same way that He turned water into wine ? Clearly not ; for He turned the water into something that did not before exist ; but He turns the wine into that which is already existing, and has been for eighteen hundred years ; and even Omnipotence cannot do that *literally* ; for that would be to make wine of the present century's vintage eighteen hundred years old *without lapse of time*. St. Cyril is responsible for no such absurdity. If the reader will turn back to page 281 of the Archbishop's book, he will find a long extract from the Saint. A part of it (which is given also in Browne on the Articles, (p. 698,) and which therefore I can rely upon as being accurately quoted, since the two agree substantially) runs thus : " And see well that you regard it [the ointment in Confirmation] not as mere ointment ; for as the bread of the Eucharist, after the invocation of the Holy Ghost, is no longer *mere* bread (οὐκ ἔτι ἄρτος λιπὸς), but the body of Christ ; so likewise this holy ointment is no longer common ointment after the invocation, but the gift of Christ and of the Holy Ghost, being rendered efficient by His divinity."—From this it is clear that unless St. Cyril held the *ointment* to be *transubstantiated*, (which I presume the Archbishop will not claim,) he did not hold the bread to be transubstantiated either.

So much for the Archbishop's Patristic "echoes."—In the closing paragraph of his chapter he has the *courage* to say—and it takes a great deal of courage to say it—"Such also is the faith of the Greek Church, which seceded from us a thousand years ago, as well as of the present Russian Church." Here are two ugly "blots," (to use Father Newman's quadriliteral euphemism for a Saxon trilateral): 1. The Greek Church did *not* secede; the secession was on the other side, and the Archbishop tries to cover it up by the old trick of crying, Stop thief! hoping, in the noise and confusion, to get *possession* (which, he is well aware, is nine points in law) of the stolen goods.—2. Such is *not* the faith of the Greek Church, and never was. The Archbishop of Syra, a distinguished prelate of the Greek Church, is (to say the least) *as* likely as the Archbishop of Baltimore, who is only a distinguished outsider, to know what the faith of the Greek Church is, and what it is not. In a conference with the Bishop of Ely, (Harold Browne, author of the work on the Articles,) F. Meyrick, and others, in England, Feb. 4, 1870, a report of which will be found in the Journal of our General Convention of 1871, (appendix, pp. 577-583,) he says: "My individual opinion is, that the bread remains bread in the mouth, and the wine remains wine in the mouth; but that at the same time as we receive them, we receive the whole body of Christ. Others have taken up the opinions of the Latin Church, and rolled them into our Church. The question is not authoritatively settled."—It is *not*, therefore a part of "the faith of the Greek Church;" for every part of the "faith" of that Church *is*, and *was*, long before the secession of the Church of Rome; "authoritatively settled."

"Rolled them in" is good. It expresses the operation exactly; and it expresses also the result; to wit, that, having been "*rolled in*," they have no foothold;

and therefore, when the Church settles the question authoritatively she will roll them out again.

The Archbishop's assertion about the Greek Church having thus been proved to be worthless, the reader is entitled to infer the equal worthlessness of the other assertions, in the same paragraph, about the "Nestorians and Eutychians," the "schismatic Copts, the Syrians, Chaldeans, Armenians, and, in short, of all the Oriental sects no longer in communion with the See of Rome;" he is warranted in taking it for granted that not one of them holds the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation.

It having thus been shown that the doctrine has no foundation in Scripture as interpreted by the Fathers and by common sense, and no seat but in the mazed brain of mediæval and modern Rome, it remains to show, in few words, that it strikes at the foundation of all confidence in the value of human testimony. And here Lacordaire, an authority to which the Archbishop cannot take exception, shall stand me in stead. I quote from his *Conferences*, Langdon's Translation, London, 1853—those Conferences that, in the last generation, set all Paris agog with their contagious enthusiasm, and might fairly challenge any one, since the days of the golden-mouthed Bishop of Constantinople, to match them in eloquence. The passages I shall quote are not specimens of the eloquence, but they are specimens of the transparent simplicity of the language, and they are all the more valuable for my purpose, in that Lacordaire never dreamed of the application that could be made of them. The wonder is, they have not long since been put in the *Index Expurgatorius*. Had they appeared in a Protestant book, they undoubtedly would have been:

"You believe, then, in bodies because you have seen them? Well, I announce to you a sad, a lamentable fact; it is that you have never seen them! What have

you seen, in effect, in that which you call a body? Certain properties—size, weight, color, form; but the substance, that which is underneath, I tell you that you have not seen it. . . . And yet you believe in the existence of bodies; you believe in it firmly; and you do well, *because in the phenomena you have sufficient reason for so doing.*” (Conference 12th, p. 167.)

“On seeing the phenomena [*i.e.*, *accidents*] of bodies, those of existence, those of the mind, we have no difficulty in believing in the substance which supports them.” (*Ibid.* p. 171.)

Here Lacordaire tells us that we see, on the altar, for instance, (for he is speaking of *all* bodies,) after the consecration of the elements, exactly what we saw before,—neither more, nor less,—to wit, the phenomena, *i.e.*, accidents,—size, color, form—of the bodies, bread and wine, and that the sight of these accidents of the bodies is our “sufficient reason” for “believing firmly” in the substance of these bodies; not in the substance of some other body, or bodies, that has taken their place.

I have said that the Roman doctrine of Transubstantiation strikes at the foundation of all confidence in the value of human testimony. Let me give one example—one is as good as a hundred—and one that is particularly in point. I refer to the testimony of the Apostles to the Resurrection of Jesus Christ. Admitting, to the full, not only the sincerity, but the objective truth, of that testimony, what, to a *consistent* believer in transubstantiation, is it *good for*? Just nothing at all. For what did they see and handle? Simply the *accidents* of the Resurrection body of Christ; for they certainly did *not* see and handle the *substance*. Now if *our* seeing and handling the accidents of the bread and wine, after consecration, is not *our* “sufficient reason” for believing in the substance of bread and wine beneath those accidents, then neither was *their* seeing and handling

the accidents of His Resurrection body *their* "sufficient reason" for believing in the substance of that Resurrection body beneath those accidents ; and so, to the *consistent* believer in transubstantiation, Christianity itself is without foundation : for, says the Apostle, (1 Cor. 15 : 14,) " If Christ be not risen, then is our preaching vain, and your faith is also vain."

Will the Archbishop say, We are to believe in the substance beneath the accidents, except where Jesus Christ (as in the case before us, by saying, This is my body ; this is my blood) has told us not to believe in it ? I answer, That is the very point in dispute, whether He *has* so told us, in so saying. Is it in the words themselves, or in the Archbishop's *interpretation* of the words ? If it is in his interpretation of the words, then I have as good a right to my interpretation of them, as he has to his ; especially as my interpretation of them is the interpretation of all Christendom for the first six hundred years, St. Augustine (as we have seen) even going so far as to say that the other interpretation, to wit, the literal, would make our Lord require of us a " disgraceful and criminal action."—If, on the other hand, it is in the words themselves, then it is also in the exactly similar words of the Archbishop himself (p. 202) : " Your son [seeing the " likenesses'"] will ask you : Who are those men ? And when you tell him : This is Washington, the Father of his Country ; this is Patrick Henry, the ardent lover of civil liberty ; and this is Taney, the incorruptible Judge, your boy will"—will what?—will, if he is a scion of the Archbishop, say : Oh ! I understand you ! You mean, This is not canvas, or marble. This is the flesh and blood of Washington, the flesh and blood of Patrick Henry, the flesh and blood of Taney ! I understand you perfectly !—Oh, but you *don't* understand me, you reply ; I don't mean any such thing. Why do you say it, then ? You say, This *is* Washington ; This *is* Patrick

Henry ; This *is* Taney : just as our Lord says, “ This *is* my body ; This *is* my blood. Surely, if transubstantiation is in the words themselves, in the one case, it is in the words themselves, in the other.

CHAPTER XXI.

COMMUNION UNDER ONE KIND.

As our Lord said to the eleven (or to the twelve, if Judas was present), “ Drink *ye all* of this,” and St. Mark records that “ they *all* drank of it ;” and as the Archbishop’s objection that this was said “ not to the people at large, but only to the Apostles,” (p. 301,) is answered, *as he very well knows*, by his admission (p. 298) that “ even the clergy of every rank, including the Pope, receive only of the consecrated bread, unless when they celebrate Mass ;” and as Cardinal Bona admits that “ always, everywhere, from the very first foundation of the Church to the 12th century, the faithful communicated under the species both of bread and wine ;” * and as the Archbishop himself confesses (p. 304) that the withholding of the cup was first enacted into a law by the Council of Constance in 1414 ; and as the *alleged* exceptional instances of communion in one kind in the early history of the Church, and the alleged sufficiency of such communion, even with Augustine and Liebnitz to back it (if they do back it), amount to nothing in the face of the plain command of our Saviour, “ Drink *ye all* of it ; and as I have already (p. 79) refuted the Archbishop’s calumnious accusation (p. 300) against “ the Protestant translators” of 1 Cor. 11 : 27, I shall confine myself to the extraordinary

* *Rev. Liturg.* l. ii. c. 18, n. 1. Apud Bingham, xv. v. 1.

paragraph about Luther, and to the last three paragraphs of the chapter, in which the Archbishop apologizes for not obeying the command of Christ by alleging certain difficulties in the way of obedience to it! The paragraph respecting Luther is as follows :

“Luther himself, even after his revolt, was so clearly convinced of this truth, *that he was an uncompromising advocate of communion under one kind.* ‘If any Council,’ he says, ‘should decree or permit both species, we would by no means acquiesce; but in spite of the Council and its statute, we would use one form, or neither, and never both.’—*De formula Missæ.*”

Of course, any one familiar with the works of Luther, knows that in the part I have *italicized* above, there is no truth. It is the old Jesuit trick of taking what the logicians call *dictum secundum quid* for *simpliciter dictum*; that is to say, in quoting what is said *relatively*, to leave out *that* relatively to which it is said, and quote it as said *absolutely*. To illustrate: On page 241, above, I said: “I scorn to be ‘*tolerated*’ in the enjoyment of that which is my birthright. Like him whose blood flows in my veins, the first Governor Dudley of Massachusetts, but for a *very* different reason, I cry out, from the bottom of my soul, and with all the strength that is in me, against this un-American, un-nineteenth-century, ‘intolerable toleration.’”—Suppose the Archbishop, or some of his understrappers, were to quote me thus: “Like him whose blood flows in my veins, the first Governor Dudley of Massachusetts, I cry out, from the bottom of my soul, and with all the strength that is in me, against this ‘intolerable toleration;’” leaving out the qualifying words, without giving any indication that anything was left out; and, commenting upon it, represent me as “an uncompromising advocate” of *intolerance*, and add, that, by my own confession, it was born and bred in me! He would be serving me exactly as he has served Luther.

But as he is in the habit of serving the Bible and the Fathers so, as I have already shown (p. 113) and have yet to show, (p. 337) it is not strange that he should serve a heretic the same scurvy sauce. Here is what Luther says, the part which I have *italicized* being that, in the first paragraph, which the Archbishop has left out. It will be seen that what Luther is denouncing is, *not* communion in both kinds, as the Archbishop represents, but, putting the Councils of men above the Word of God :

“ If *by any chance* a Council *by its own authority* should decree or permit it, *in that contingency* by no means would we use both species ; rather, *then first*, in spite *as well* of the Council *as* of its statute, would we use one or other of the two only, or neither, and by no means both, *and would plainly anathematize those, whosoever they might be who, on the authority of such Council or statute, should use both.*

“ Do you wonder, and ask why ? Listen ; If you know the bread and the wine to have been instituted by Christ, both, namely, to be taken by all, as the Gospels and Paul most clearly testify, so that even our adversaries are compelled to confess it, and yet dare not believe and trust Him, so as to take it on His authority, (*literally, to take it so*), but are bold to take it, if men in their Council decree it, are you not in that case preferring men to Christ ? Are you not exalting Men of sin above all that is called God, or that is worshipped ? Are you not relying upon the words of men, rather than upon the words of God ? Nay, you altogether distrust the words of God, and believe only the words of men. But how great is that abomination and denial of the Most High God ? What idolatry then can equal your so scrupulous obedience to a Council of men ? Ought you not rather a thousand times to die ? Ought you not rather to receive one

species or none, than, in such obedience so sacrilegious and apostasy of faith, to receive both?"

The Archbishop would only be serving St. Paul in the same way as he here serves Luther, if he were to write thus :

" 'We are not under the law, but under grace.' St. Paul himself, even after his conversion, was so clearly convinced of this truth, that he was an uncompromising advocate of sinning that grace might abound. 'God be thanked,' he says, 'that ye were the servants of sin.' (Rom. 6 : 17.)"

Do you say, reader, the Archbishop wouldn't treat St. Paul so? I have showed you how he *did* treat him ; and if you have forgotten, you can refresh your memory, if not your equanimity, by turning back to page 113. I have showed you also how he treats the Fathers, and will show you more before I get through. The sorrowful fact is that you can't trust, not only his representations of them, but even his (professed) quotations from them.

A word now on the last three paragraphs of the chapter, in which the Archbishop shows, in palliation of his and his Church's disobedience to the plain command of Christ, how "very difficult" (p. 304) and how "very distasteful" (p. 305) it is to obey that command.

The *difficulty* is, to procure a sufficiency of pure wine for so many communicants. I answer, where there's a will, there's a way : the demand creates the supply ; and to ensure its purity, the Church has but to take the matter into her own hands.

The *distastefulness* is another matter : "It would be very distasteful, besides," says the Archbishop, "for so many communicants to drink successively out of the same chalice." This is an objection I never thought to hear from a Christian, let alone an Archbishop. The Communicants for the first one thousand years, as he himself admits, did, in large numbers, drink out of

the same cup. The truth is, this squeamishness is artificial. Children are not troubled with it: and all Christians should, in this respect, be children in the family of Christ.

But, says the Archbishop, "in our larger churches, where communion is distributed every Sunday to hundreds, there would be great danger of spilling a portion of the consecrated chalice, and of thus exposing it to profanation." I answer, the danger is imaginary. I have, myself, in the course of my ministry of nearly forty years, "delivered the cup" to thousands upon thousands—to hundreds on the same day—to scores Sunday after Sunday, for months together—and never yet have I spilled the first drop, or seen a communicant spill it. But even were the danger tenfold greater than it is, we are not responsible for it, or for any unavoidable profanation consequent upon it.

The Archbishop winds up the chapter with the declaration, "should circumstances ever justify or demand a change from the present discipline, the Church will not hesitate to restore the cup to the laity."

So then, the *difficulty*, and the *distastefulness*, and the *danger*, are bogus, after all! For an unanswerable reply to his own arguments, sometimes on the very next page, commend me to the Archbishop.

CHAPTER XXII.

THE SACRIFICE OF THE MASS.

As the *Roman doctrine* of the Sacrifice of the Mass is built upon Transubstantiation, and as I have already shown that that is without warrant, either of Scripture as interpreted by the Fathers, or of common sense, this chapter need not detain us long.

That the Eucharist is a Sacrifice of prayer and praise, including a memorial of the one Sacrifice offered up *once for all* upon the Cross for the Redemption of the whole world, an oblation of the bread and wine, of alms, and, above all, of the body, soul, and spirit of the worshippers as a living sacrifice, is the doctrine of Holy Scripture, of the early Liturgies, of the Fathers of the first five centuries, and of our Reformers ; but not one of them all gives any countenance to the Roman doctrine of a propitiatory sacrifice of a *victim* in the Mass.

Says St. Chrysostom, (Hom. xvii. in Heb.) “ There is but one sacrifice ; we do not offer another sacrifice, but continually the same : *or rather, we make a memorial of the sacrifice*—*μᾶλλον δὲ ἀνάμνησιν ἐργαζόμεθα θυσίας.*”

Says St. Augustine (Contr. Faust. xx. 18) : “ Unde jam Christiani *peracti ejusdem sacrificii memoriam* celebrant, sacrosancta oblatione, Corporis et Sanguinis Christi :” *i.e.*, Christians celebrate the *memorial* of the same *fully finished* sacrifice, by sacred oblation, and participation of Christ’s Body and Blood.”

And Ridley, the Martyr : “ The whole substance of our sacrifice, which is frequented of the Church in the Lord’s Supper, consisteth in prayers, praise, and giving of thanks, and in remembering and showing forth of that sacrifice upon the altar of the cross ; that the same might continually be *had in reverence by mystery*, which, once only and no more, was offered as the price of our redemption.” (*Disputations at Oxford, Works, Parker Society*, p. 211.) And, in his *Piteous Lamentation*, (*Works*, p. 52,) he calls the modern Roman Mass—and all the Fathers of the first five centuries would have called it the same, if it had been even dreamed of in their day, which it was not—“ a new blasphemous kind of sacrifice, to satisfy and pay the price of sins, both of the dead and of the quick, to the great and intolerable con-

tumely of Christ our Saviour, His death and passion ; which was, and is the only sufficient and everlasting, available sacrifice, satisfactory for all the elect of God, from Adam the first, to the last that shall be born to the end of the World."

The Archbishop talks about the Pagan sacrifices of *victims*, and quotes Plutarch in proof of their universality ; as if Pagans, in their worship, were examples for Christians ! He talks also of the Patriarchal and Jewish sacrifices of *victims*, as if the Apostle had not taught us (Heb. vii., viii., ix., and x.) that they have all been *fulfilled* and brought to an end in the *One Sacrifice* of the *One Victim*, on Calvary. He quotes also the *prophecy* (Mal. i : 11), "From the rising of the sun even to the going down, My Name is great among the Gentiles, and in every place there is sacrifice, and there is offered to My Name a clean oblation." But the word "sacrifice," taken by him from the Douay, which follows the Vulgate, is a mistranslation : the Hebrew word (*muktar*) doesn't mean "sacrifice ;" it means "incense," and can't mean anything else. But, not satisfied with the Vulgate's and the Douay's perversion of the text, he perverts it still more in his comment on it : "He (God) clearly predicts," he says, "by the mouth of the Prophet Malachiah, that the immolations of the Jews would be succeeded by a clean *victim*, which would be offered up not on a single altar, as was the case in Jerusalem, but in every part of the known world." (p. 310.)

He *should* predict that, to make it a prediction of the modern Roman Mass : but he *doesn't* ; that word *victim* is a sheer fabrication of the Archbishop's, without warrant even from the Vulgate or the Douay. The "pure *offering*," or, as the Douay expresses it, "clean *oblation*," is the "*minchah* of the Mosaic law, which is never a *victim*, but is, as his own authority the Douay (Lev. 6 : 15) could tell him, an offering of "flour that

is tempered with oil," and is accompanied with the burning of "frankincense."

Passing over 1 Cor. 11 : 23-26, which has been already (p. 291) considered, we come, in the order followed by the Archbishop, to Acts 13 : 2. As they "were ministering (or, as the Greek text expresses it," says the Archbishop, "*sacrificing*) to the Lord." That is exactly what it *doesn't* "express:" had it "expressed" it, the Vulgate and the Douay would have been only too happy to have so translated it. The Greek word for sacrifice is *θύω*;—*λειτουργέω*, which is the word used by the Apostle, is a generic one, and signifies *performing the SERVICE*, praying, praising, giving thanks, sacrificing, or whatever that service may be.

We come next, and last, to Heb. 13 : 10 : "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." "The Apostle here plainly declares," says the Archbishop, "that the Christian Church has its altars as well as the Jewish synagogue." If that is all the Apostle declares, the Church is poorly off for altars ; for everybody knows the synagogue had none, and has none to the present day : altars were confined to the Temple. "An altar," continues the Archbishop, "necessarily supposes a sacrifice, without which it has no meaning." Very true.* But it does not necessarily suppose a *victim*. The Altar of Incense (Exod. 30 : 1-10) was for the offering of incense, and no other sacrifice was allowed (Exod. 30 : 9) to be offered on it.—The meat offering, also, (Lev. 2 : 1, 2,) which was not (as the word meat in its *present* signification might lead the reader to suppose) a flesh offering, but an offering of flour mingled with oil, and accompanied with incense, was offered upon the altar, *i.e.*, sacrificed ; in other words, *made sacred* (for that is the meaning of *sacrificed*) to God. Gifts also were offered upon the altar, and to that our Lord has reference when he says (St. Matt.

* I leave out of the account the Altar of Witness, (Joshua xxii.) because it *presupposed* an altar of real offerings.

5 : 23,) "If thou bring thy gift to the altar;" and so does the Apostle when having spoken (Heb. 13 : 15) of "the *sacrifice* of praise," he adds in the next verse, "But to do good and to communicate (alms) forget not; for with such *sacrifices* God is well pleased."

We have an altar then, and a sacrifice, or rather, sacrifices; sacrifices (*i.e.*, oblations) of bread and wine—the very sacrifice that Melchizedec offered—sacrifices of prayer and praise and thanksgiving—sacrifices of our substance—sacrifices of ourselves. We have an altar, a sacrifice, a priest; but the Catholic altar, the Catholic sacrifice, the Catholic priest, and the Roman altar, the Roman sacrifice, the Roman priest, are heaven-wide from each other.

After remarking on Psalm 110 : 4, that our Lord is a "priest *forever*," because His sacrifice is "perpetual," which, if he means by it perpetually *offering*, is in conflict with Heb. 10 : 10-14, the Archbishop passes on to the unwritten word :

"Tradition, with its hundred tongues, proclaims the perpetual oblation of the sacrifice of the Mass, from the time of the Apostles to our own days." (p. 314.)

"Hundred tongues" is good. The genuine tradition, from our Lord and his Apostles, is authenticated to us in *one* tongue, the Greek, and speaks to us with one voice, as it spoke in the beginning, and ever shall speak. The Archbishop's hundred-tongued animal is like Virgil's *Fame* (*Æn.* iv. 173): "a monster horrid, huge, with as many wakeful eyes, (wonderful to tell,) as many tongues, as many sounding mouths, as many pricked-up ears, as it has feathers on its body." "Flourishing in locomotivity, and gaining strength by going; small and timid at first; soon it raises itself to the breezes, stalks along on the ground, and hides its head *in the clouds*." The Archbishop is welcome to his pet,

centum multiloquacibus oris
Gaudentem, et pariter facta atque infecta canentem.

“ If we consult the Fathers of the Church . . . if we consult the General Councils . . . they will all tell us,” etc. (p. 314.)

We have seen what the Archbishop’s wholesale assertions about, and retail quotations from, the Fathers, are worth ; or rather, what they are *not* worth ; and as he does not, here, venture even so much as to refer to, not to say quote, even one of them by name, we may commend his prudence, and pass on.

His argument from the “ Nestorians and Eutychians” and the “ Greek schismatics” (p. 315) has been already disposed of in the chapter on transubstantiation, (p. 297) and needs no further remark.

“ But of all proofs in favor of the Apostolic origin of the sacrifice of the Mass,* the most convincing is found in the Liturgies of the Church.” (p. 315.)

The *Catholic* doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice, as embodied in the early liturgies, is as unlike the Archbishop’s “ sacrifice of the Mass” as the *Catholic* doctrine of the Real Presence is unlike mediæval Transubstantiation. They are heaven-wide from each other. Rome claims she brings God down upon her altars, to worship Him there ; a blasphemous claim. The keynote of the Ancient Liturgies is,

Sursum corda ! Lift up your hearts !

Habemus ad Dominum. We lift them up to Thee.

“ St. Paul says that Jesus was offered once. How, then, can we offer Him daily ? I answer, that Jesus was offered once in a bloody manner, and it is of this sacrifice that the Apostle speaks. But in the sacrifice of the Mass He is offered up in an unbloody manner. . . . daily offered on ten thousand altars.”

“ If the wounds of the martyrs plead so eloquently for us, how much more eloquent is the blood of Jesus shed daily upon our altars ?”

* The name Mass (Latin, *Missa*) was first used as a distinctive title of the Eucharist by St. Ambrose near the end of the fourth century. Even then it was only a change of name, not of thing. It was two or three centuries later before the *corruptions* of it had crept in.

Reader, I assure you both these extracts are genuine, and they are found in the Archbishop's book only four pages apart; the first on page 317, the last on page 321. The first *looks* like the "unbloody sacrifice" of the Ancient Liturgies; but that is of the symbols of Christ's Body and Blood, not of Christ Himself; the last is bald transubstantiation.

CHAPTER XXIII.

RELIGIOUS CEREMONIES.

"OMIT that," said a Spanish monarch to one of his courtiers; "it's only a ceremony." "Sire," replied the courtier, "the king himself is but a ceremony." There is a deep truth in this, as also in the old conundrum, What is *majesty*, stript of its externals? A jest.* Strip Rome of her externals—those of them, I mean, that are peculiarly hers—and where would she be?

"The flame of piety," the Archbishop tells us, (p. 323,) "is nourished by the outward forms of religion. The fruit of a tree does not consist in its bark or its leaves and branches. Nevertheless, you never saw a tree bearing fruit, unless when clothed with bark, adorned with branches, [*why* "adorned?" Are branches for *ornament*?], and covered with leaves."

There the Archbishop is mistaken, as the commentators on the "fig-tree" having "nothing but leaves" (St. Mark 11 : 13) could tell him: "If haply, *εἰ ἄρα*: that is, because it had leaves; since the leaves of the fig-tree appear *after the fruit*."—*Lange*. Dr. South shall furnish him with a better comparison. I quote from memory:

"Our adversaries tell us that forms are not religion.

* M a jest y.

We do not claim that they are ; but they are to religion what clothing is to the body ; they keep in the vital warmth." The comparison is an admirable one. All the clothing in the world will not warm a corpse : there must be the inner life. Even then, we may keep it so thinly clad that it shall go shivering with cold : and that is what " Geneva " does, or did, fifty years ago. On the other hand, we may smother, or swelter, it ; and that is what Rome does. The English Reformers kept to the " golden mean," though at one time they came near going to the Genevan extreme. " They were disgusted with the everlasting dinning into their ears the outside of the Church, as though it had no inside. The homely proverb of our ancestors reminded those who were too much enraptured with the external of the human form divine that ' beauty was but skin deep ; ' which was certainly true, as Apollo no doubt found out when he flayed Marsyas. Now there were those who were for flaying the Church, to get at the holiness beneath ; on the other hand, there were those who seemed to look upon her as all skin ; no bone, and muscle, and sinew : no heart, and mind, and soul, and strength ; no quickening spirit. Or, to change the figure, there were those who seemed to think Dress was everything, and who therefore went on piling upon her panner upon panner, flounce upon flounce, furbelow upon furbelow, of rites and ceremonies, till she looked more like a bedizened harlot than like the chaste bride of Christ, and wanted little of being smothered in her lendings. No wonder those who found her gasping, and succeeded in stripping off the cumbrous additions, when they saw the reviving influence of the fresh air upon her, came nigh going on with the disrobal, and leaving her shivering in the cold, without clothing enough to keep in the vital warmth. One extreme begat another. The real wonder was that the English Reformers should, in their public, official acts,

have kept so closely as they did to the old, Catholic way in which the Fathers walked in the beginning, and found rest to their souls. No doubt, as the Count De Maistre said, it was 'the English good sense,' that 'preserved the hierarchy ;' * but surely the hand of God was in it."—*Afterpiece to the Comedy of Convocation.*

The Archbishop thinks he finds warrant for a "gorgeous ritual" in the Revelation of St. John : "Angels with golden censers stand before the throne, while elders cast their crowns of gold before the Lamb once slain. Then that unnumbered multitude of all nations, tongues, and people, clothed in white raiment, bearing palms of victory," etc.—(p. 326.)

"Palms of *victory*" are for the Church triumphant, not for the Church militant. But even if we are to take the language literally (which, by the way, would require us (Rev. 14 : 1) to have the name of God literally "written on our foreheads") and the worship of the Church triumphant for a pattern to the Church militant, the "white raiment" seems much more in keeping with *our* ritual than with that of the "woman arrayed in purple and scarlet, (Rev. 17 : 4,) and decked with gold and precious stones and pearls . . . the mother of harlots . . . drunken with the blood of the saints." Of course, no church will put on this coat unless it *fits* ; unless a scarlet-robed ritual is its *peculium*.

* " 'Were it permitted to establish degrees of importance amongst things of Divine institution,' he says, '*I should place the hierarchy before dogma—to so great a degree is the former indispensable to the maintenance of the faith. One may cite in favor of this theory a splendid experience which for three centuries has been conspicuous in the eyes of all Europe; I mean the Anglican Church, which has preserved a dignity and weight absolutely foreign to all other Reformed Churches entirely because the English good sense has preserved the hierarchy.*' "—De Maistre, *Lettre à une Dame Russe*, vol. ii., p. 285, *Lettres et Opus. ined.*—Quoted by Ffoulkes, *Christianity's Divisions.* London, 1865, p. 200.

CHAPTER XXIV.

CEREMONIES OF THE MASS—THE MISSAL—LATIN LANGUAGE—LIGHTS—FLOWERS—INCENSE—VESTMENTS.

THE Archbishop invites the "dear reader" to "walk together" with him "into a Catholic" (meaning a Roman) "Church, in time to assist" (that is,—by a Gallicism more honored in the breach, than in the observance—*be present as a looker-on*) "at the late Mass, which is the most solemn service of the Catholic" (meaning Roman) "Liturgy." As I hold most undoubtingly that "the Sacraments were not ordained of Christ *to be gazed upon*" (Art. XXV.,) and as he does not invite me to partake, and as (moreover) a man is known by the company he keeps, I prefer to stay outside and hear what he has to say for himself:

"The Canon of the Mass never varies throughout the year, and descends to us from the first ages of the Church with scarcely the addition of a word." (p. 330.)

I have before me "The Roman * Missal, Translated into the English Language for the use of the Laity. . . . By the Right Rev. Doctor England, Late Bishop of Charleston. To which is added The Vespers. Philadelphia, Eugene Cummiskey, 1843," and I am happy to say that it bears out the Archbishop's declaration. There is *very* little that is objectionable in the *words* of the "Canon" proper. Leave out the word *host*, Lat. *hostia*, which means *victim*, and is so translated in the second paragraph following the elevation of the chalice, leave out also the *oblique* invocation (there is no *direct* invocation in the "Canon") of the Virgin and the Saints, "by whose *merits* and prayers

* Observe, it is the Roman Missal, not the Catholic Missal.

grant," etc., and there is nothing in the Canon that I should object to; and nothing that any (Trinitarian) Protestant would object to, except the "Commemoration of the Dead," which reads thus, and which is certainly primitive, being found in all the early Liturgies:

"Be mindful, O Lord, of thy servants N. and N. who are gone before us with the sign of Faith, and rest in the sleep of peace.

"To these, O Lord, and to all that sleep in Christ, grant, we beseech thee a place of refreshment, light, and peace: through the same Christ our Lord. *Amen.*"

The word "refreshment," especially in its Latin form *refrigerium* may be suggestive of Purgatory at the present day, but it carried no such suggestion in the early days of the Church, for the very good reason that the very idea of Purgatory, as we have already seen, (p. 234,) was then unknown. Tertullian (A.D. 150-220) calls the love-feast a refreshment (*refrigerium*); (*Apol.* 39 :) and Jerome, in the Vulgate (the authoritative Version of the Roman Church) renders "times of refreshing" by the same word; and he also renders "oft refreshed me" (2 Tim. 1 : 16) by *refrigeravit*, and Exodus 13 : 12, "that thine ox and thine ass may rest, (spoken of the sabbath,) and the son of thine handmaid and the stranger may be refreshed," by *refrigeretur*. Even if the word *did* signify *cooling*, it would not imply purgatory, for says Prof. Ornsby, in his Greek Testament, with the *imprimatur* of Cardinal Cullen, on Acts 3 : 20, "*The times of refreshment* mean eternal blessedness, as it were a cooling from the heat [not of purgatory, but] of *this life's* temptations and afflictions."

I said there was very little to object to in the *words* of the "Canon of the Mass;" in the *deeds*, on the other hand,—the *elevation of the host*, for instance, as enjoined in the rubric,—there is everything to object to; it has no warrant in the (uninterpolated) primitive Liturgies, or in the usage of the Church for the first six hundred

years and more ; it came in with transubstantiation, and it will go out with it.

In the "*Ordinary* of the Mass," there is more to object to than in the "Canon ;" for instance, the *Confiteor* or Confession "to Almighty God, to blessed Mary . . . to all the saints, and to you, Father," to wit, to the Priest ; there is no *such* confession in any of the primitive Liturgies.

"You are probably familiar with the *Episcopal Book of Common Prayer*, and have no doubt admired its beautiful simplicity of diction. But perhaps you will be surprised when I inform you that this Prayer-Book is for the most part a translation from our Missal." (p. 331.)

I *should* be surprised, had I not long since learned, in reading the Archbishop's courageous utterances, *nil admirari*. Perhaps you will be surprised, reader, when I inform you that not only "the most part" of the Prayer-Book (outside of what is taken from Holy Scripture), but nearly all that is *Catholic* in the Missal, is a translation from the primitive Liturgies. Hence the similarity between them in certain parts ; a similarity, however, that does *not* extend to "diction." Compare, for instance, the Collect for the Fourth Sunday after Easter, (suggested by the season at which I am writing this,) as given by Bishop England, with its transfiguration in the Prayer-Book :

PRAYER-BOOK.

"O Almighty God, who alone canst order the unruly wills and affections of sinful men ; Grant unto thy people that they may love the thing which thou commandest and desire that which thou dost promise ; that so among the sundry and manifold changes of the world, our hearts may surely there be fixed where true joys are to be found ; through Jesus Christ our Lord."

MISSAL.

"O God, who makest the faithful to be of one mind : grant that thy people may love what thou commandest, and desire what thou promisest : that amidst the uncertainties of this world, we may place our affections where there are true joys. Through Jesus Christ our Lord."

That the reader may not think that this is exceptional, I give, from the Missal, the Collects for the two following Sundays and the intervening Ascension Day ; the reader who has the Prayer-Book at hand can compare them with those for the corresponding Sundays and Festival in it :

Fifth Sun. af. Easter :—" O God, from whom all that is good proceeds : grant that thy people, by thy inspiration, may resolve on what is right, and by thy direction, put it in practice. Through"—

Ascension Day :—" Grant, we beseech thee, O Almighty God, that we, who believe that thy only Son, our Redeemer, ascended this day into heaven, may also have our hearts always fixed on heavenly things. Through"—

Sun. af. Ascension.—" O Almighty and Eternal God, inspire thy servants with true devotion, and grant that we may serve thy divine Majesty with sincere hearts. Through"—

Those who have made the comparison, will see that there is no connection between this last Collect and the corresponding one in the Prayer-Book, but that they are from entirely different sources ; which is also the case with a good many other of the Sunday Collects : and, while they admit the *bald* simplicity of diction of the Missal, will be prepared to agree with the Archbishop in " admiring" the "*beautiful* simplicity of diction" of the Prayer-Book.

The Archbishop, after some further explanation of ceremonies, proceeds to explain " why the Mass is said in Latin," and gives, among other reasons this : that " the Fathers of the early Church generally wrote in the Latin tongue." (p. 333.) That the reader may see what dependence is to be placed on this wholesale declaration, (as on so many similar ones throughout the book, I subjoin the following list of the Fathers of

the first six centuries ; the dates are in some instances only approximate :

GREEK.

*Clemens Romanus.....	70
Barnabas.....	75
*Ignatius.....	107
Polycarp.....	108
Hermas.....	145
*Justin Martyr.....	147
Athenagoras.....	177
*Irenæus.....	180
Clemens Alex.....	194
*Origen.....	230
Dionysius Alex.....	265
Gregory Thaumaturgus.....	270
*Eusebius.....	315
Athanasius.....	350
*Cyril Jerus.....	350
*Basil.....	370
Gregory Nazianzen.....	370
Gregory Nyssen.....	370
*Epiphanius.....	370
*Chrysostom.....	398
Cyril Alex.....	412
Isidore of Pelusium.....	412
Theodoret.....	423
Socrates.....	440
Sozomen.....	440
Evagrius.....	594

LATIN,

Minutius, Felix....	177
*Tertullian.....	190
*Cyprian.....	250
Arnobius.....	303
Lactantius.....	306
Hilary of Poitiers.....	350
Pacian.....	350
*Ambrose.....	374
*Jerome.....	390
*Augustine.....	400
Hilary of Arles.....	424
Vincent of Lerins.....	434
Prosper of Aquitaine.....	440
*Leo the Great.....	440
Gelasius. Pope.....	492
*Gregory the Great.....	590

That is to say, in the first three centuries, *twelve* Greek Fathers, *three* Latin ones ; in the next three centuries, *fourteen* Greek Fathers, *thirteen* Latin ones : in all, during the first six centuries,—and “the *early Church*” can hardly embrace more,—*twenty-six* Greek Fathers, and sixteen Latin ones. I believe I have omitted none, of any repute, whose works have come down to us. I have marked with a *star* those that are appealed to as authorities by the Archbishop ; it will be seen that *ten* of them are Greek, and *seven* Latin : and yet we are assured by the Archbishop that “the Fathers of the early Church *generally* wrote in the Latin

tongue ! And he gravely gives this as one reason for having the Mass in Latin. Another of his reasons is put interrogatively : " How, I ask, could the Bishops of these various countries communicate with each other in council, if they had not one language to serve as a common medium of communication ? " (p. 334.) To which I reply : Does the Archbishop suppose that there is one among his fifty thousand, or five times fifty thousand, readers, who is so big a fool as not to see that the need of the Bishops aforesaid, with fifty or a hundred different mother-tongues, has nothing whatever to do with the need of an ordinary congregation of worshippers, with one common mother tongue ? Really, he *should* give his readers credit for at least a hundredth part of a grain of common sense.

Another of his reasons is that the faith of the Roman Church being "*always one and the same faith*"—which, as we have seen isn't true, for it has changed twice within twenty-five years—should be enshrined in a dead language. " Faith," he says, " may be called the jewel, and the language is the casket which contains it. So careful is the Church of preserving the jewel intact, that she will not disturb even the casket in which the jewel is set. Living tongues, unlike a dead language, are continually changing in words and in their meaning. The English language, as written four centuries ago, would be now almost as unintelligible to an English reader as the Latin tongue." (p. 333.)

Here is a specimen of the language as written over *five* centuries ago, to wit, in 1356 ; it is from the *Travels of Sir John Mandeville*, as given in the Introduction to *Webster Unabridged*, p. xxxix. Let us see whether it is " as unintelligible to an English reader as the Latin tongue : "

" After for to speke of Jerusalem the holy cytee, yee schull undirstonde that it stont full faire betwene hilles, and there be no ryveres ne welles, but water cometh by condyte from Ebron. . . . "

And here is another specimen taken from Wycliffe (1380), just five hundred years old next year :

“For sothe when Jhesus hadde comen doun fro the hil, many cumpanyes folewiden hym. And loo ! a leprouse man cummynge worshipide hym, sayinge : Lord, yif thou wolt, thou maist make me clene. . . .”

The chief difficulty is in the spelling. Occasionally you meet with a word that has changed its meaning ; as in this sentence of Chaucer, which was, perhaps, what led the Archbishop into image-worship : “The sin of mawmetry (idolatry) is the first that is *defended* in the ten commandments.” To *defend* (*fend off*) meant originally to *forbid*. “Which God *defend* that I should wrong from him.”—*Shakespeare*. That the English of three hundred years ago is still “understanded of the people,” the Prayer-Book is a standing proof.

But, says the Archbishop, “the congregation could not be expected to hear the priest, even if he spoke in English, since his face is turned from them, and the greater part of what he says is pronounced in an undertone.” (p. 336.) To which I reply, Speak louder, and don’t mumble your words like a heathen priest ! “When the priest says Mass, he is speaking not to the people, but to God, to whom all languages are equally intelligible.” (p. 336.) Yes, and the people, who ought to be praying with him, are either gazing, or else praying each on his own hook, with perhaps a dozen different manuals in use in the same congregation at the same time. If any one of them were trying to join in the public prayer, the Apostle’s question (1 Cor. 14 : 16) would come *home* to the priest, “How shall he that occupieth the room of the unlearned say the Amen (τὸ ἀμὴν) at thy giving of thanks (τῇ σῇ εὐχαριστίᾳ, thy *Eucharist*), seeing he understandeth not what thou sayest ?”

The Archbishop next introduces his “dear reader” to “lighted chandeliers,” and thinks, “assuredly that

cannot be improper in the New Dispensation which God sanctioned in the Old. (p. 337.) If so, the sacrificing of bulls and goats cannot be improper. Diogenes lighted a candle at mid-day and said, "I seek a man!" Perhaps that is what the Archbishop is seeking in the Roman Church. Ten years ago he might have found one—Dr. Döllinger; but now she has cast him out. She doesn't like a man, for the same reason that the Archbishop doesn't like the English language in worship: it's too *live*. But, "in the primitive days," the Christians, on account of persecution, were obliged to "worship in the Catacombs;" and as these "did not admit the light of the sun, the faithful were obliged to have lights even in the open day:" *therefore* the Church, now that she is above ground, has them still! Lights have also "a symbolical meaning;" they "serve to remind us to let our light so shine before men," etc.; are "a sign of spiritual joy," etc., etc.; to all which, the primitive Christians, before they were driven into the Catacombs, would have replied in the words of the Apostle (1 Cor. 11:16), "We have no such custom, neither the churches of God." And the same reply they would have made in regard to *incense*, which was in keeping with the worship under the Old Law, but is out of keeping with the worship under the New.

A simple wreath of *flowers* at Easter is as unobjectionable as a wreath of evergreens at Christmas; but to turn the font into a flower-pot, which there seems an irresistible temptation to do because it is so *convenient*, is to make ornament take the place of use, which we have no right to do. Moreover, a pyramid of flowers in the font, instead of a wreath around it, is in as bad taste as a pyramid of orange blossoms would be on the head of a bride, instead of a wreath of them around it. The spiritual Church is the Bride of Christ, and the adornment of the material edifice should be in

harmony therewith. So of the *vestments* of the priests that minister at her altars : white is the apocalyptic color of the *bride* ; purple and scarlet are for the *harlot* " that sitteth upon many waters." (Rev. 19 : 8, and 17 : 1-4.)

CHAPTER XXV.

THE SACRAMENT OF PENANCE.

THE very title of this chapter is a misnomer ; for, says the Catechism of the Council of Trent (p. 139, Donovan's Translation, Baltimore, John Murphy), " Every Sacrament consists of two things : ' matter,' which is called the element, and ' form,' which is commonly called ' the word.' . . . By the words ' sensible thing,' therefore, the Fathers understand not only the matter or element, such as water in baptism, chrism (ointment) in confirmation, and oil in extreme unction, *all of which fall under the eye* ; but also the words which constitute the form, and which are addressed to the ear." Very good : let us hold the Catechism to its definition. And will it now be good enough to tell us what is the " matter" of the " sacrament of penance?" O yes, says the Catechism (p. 241), " the matter of the other sacraments is some production of nature or art ; but the acts of the penitent, contrition, confession, and satisfaction, constitute, as has been defined by the Council of Trent, the matter as it were (quasi materia) of the sacrament of penance." Really, this is such an *Irish* definition that we are half inclined to suspect Father Donovan of the paternity of it, and not the original Latin of the Catechism. First we are told, by way of definition, of the matter of the sacrament of penance, what the matter of the other

sacraments is ; this is certainly Irish. Next, we are told not what the *matter* of the sacrament of penance is, but what the *matter as it were* is. Now matter-as-it-were isn't matter at all. Had the definition of a Sacrament said, the "matter as it were," and the "form," then the explanation would have been to the point ; but it says, the "matter," and the "form." By this time the reader will begin to think that though nothing is the matter *of* the sacrament, something is the matter *with* it. But let that pass.

The Archbishop devotes several pages to the "power of the keys," the power to "bind" and to "loose," to "remit" and to "retain," and argues (p. 348) that this power "was not restricted to the Apostles, but extended to their successors in the ministry, unto all times and places." In this I am happy to agree with him. The power is as much needed now as it was in the Apostles' day. I have this power, and exercise it as a part of my ministry. I exercise this power whenever I baptize one that offers himself for baptism, or decline to baptize him, according as I *judge* him to be, or not to be, in a suitable condition to be baptized. In the same way, I exercise the power in admitting or declining to admit him to the Holy Communion, and in suspending him therefrom after he has been admitted, if occasion require, and in restoring him again when I judge him penitent, and otherwise prepared for restoration. In these instances my action is *judicial*, and as I am fallible, as all the ministers of Christ are, since "we have this treasure in earthen vessels," I may mistake, and "bind" one who should not be bound, and "loose" one who should not be loosed ; and in that case what I "bind on earth" is "bound in heaven," and what I "loose on earth" is "loosed in heaven" only so far as the outward act, with what is tied to it, is concerned : my judicial act cannot reach to his internal relation to God. Again ; I exercise the power when,

in the Morning and Evening Service and in the Celebration of the Holy Communion, Christ speaking by me as His ambassador then and there absolves all those—and only those—who then and there have “with hearty repentance and true faith” confessed their sins unto Him: the Absolution goes forth on its errand like the “Peace” of St. Luke 10 : 5, 6, and if *the son of absolution* be there, it finds him, and “rests upon him ;” if not, it turns to the absolver again. But, it will be said, if the one confessing is penitent—and if he is not his confession is worthless—he is already absolved. I answer, Yes—in the mind of the Great Absolver ; but it does not follow that the penitent has yet consciously *appropriated* it. There is the same reason for the spoken absolution in public worship that there is for the spoken confession : the one corresponds to and is the complement of the other. Once more ; I exercise the power when, in the pulpit, or in private to one who comes to me in private to “open his grief,” I, “by the ministry of God’s Holy Word,” or by “ghostly counsel and advice,” give (not the *form* but) the “*benefit* of absolution,” to the quieting of a disturbed conscience, and “the removing of all scruple and doubtfulness.” In these last mentioned instances the absolving is *ministerial*, and is as real and as effective in its sphere as is the judicial in its. Many a time has a seemingly casual utterance from the pulpit reached some stricken soul and ministered to it a real absolution. It is a mighty power ; all the mightier that it is exclusively spiritual. It is given in some measure to every Christian, for every Christian is a king and a priest unto God (Rev. 1 : 6 ; 1 St. Peter 2 : 9) ; but it is given specially to the ambassador of Christ. And it is given not as a personal favor to him, as the Archbishop seems to suppose ; but as a favor to those for whose benefit he is to exercise it. I say, *as the Archbishop seems to suppose*. Here is what he says :

“ But of what use would it be to give the Apostles the keys of God’s treasures for the ransom of sinners if every sinner could obtain his ransom without applying to the Apostles? If I gave you, dear reader, the keys of my house, authorizing you to admit whom you please, that they might partake of the good things contained in it, you would conclude that I *had done you a small favor* if you discovered that every one was possessed of a private key, and could enter when he pleased, without consulting you.” (p. 349.)

What an utterance for a Christian Bishop! It reminds us irresistibly, by contrast, of an utterance, under like circumstances, of the great Jewish Lawgiver: “ And there ran a young man, and told Moses, and said, Eldad and Medad do prophesy in the camp. And Joshua the son of Nun, the servant of Moses, one of his young men, answered and said, My lord Moses, forbid them. And Moses said unto him, Enviest thou for my sake? Would God that all the LORD’s people were prophets, and that the LORD would put his spirit upon them.” (Num. 11 : 27-29.) How different the Archbishop’s utterance from that of Moses! How different from that of St. Paul (2 Cor. 1 : 24): “ Not for that we have dominion over your faith, but are helpers of your joy”! How different from that of the Prince of the Apostles (1 St. Peter 5 : 3): “ Neither as being lords over God’s heritage, but being ensamples to the flock”!

But the most remarkable part of the whole thing is, that the Catechism of the Council of Trent has served the Archbishop this same scurvy sauce, to wit, given one of the keys, the key of baptism, not only to everybody in the Church, but to everybody out of it: “ Those who may administer baptism in case of necessity, but without its solemn ceremonies, hold the third and last place; and in this class are included all, even

the laity, men and women, to whatever sect they may belong. This power extends, in case of necessity, *even to Jews, infidels, and heretics*; provided, however, they intend to do what the Catholic Church does in that act of her ministry." (p. 159.) According to the Archbishop's own showing, the Catechism has done him "small favor," and one that, evidently, is *not* "gratefully acknowledged."

The paragraph which contains the remarkable utterance we have been considering begins with, "It follows, secondly, that forgiveness of sin was ordinarily to be obtained only through the ministry of the Apostles and their successors;" the previous paragraph, which we have already considered, having begun with, "It follows, first, that the forgiving power was not restricted to the Apostles." Now this second "following" is exactly what *doesn't* "follow," any more than it follows from the *institution* of physicians of the body, that bodily health is ordinarily to be obtained only through their ministry. The physician of the body ordinarily presides at our natural birth, as the physician of the soul ordinarily presides at our spiritual birth; but, as to make the physician of the body an *ordinary* resort is the surest way to ruin the bodily health, so to make the physician of the soul an ordinary resort is the surest way to ruin the spiritual health; in the spiritual therapeutic, as in the physical, continually *dosing* destroys the *tone* of the system.

"It follows, in the third place, that the power of forgiving sins on the part of God's minister involves the obligation of confessing them on the part of the sinner. The priest . . . must exercise the power with judgment and discretion. . . . But how will he judge of the disposition of the sinner unless he knows his sins? and how will the priest know his sins, unless they are confessed?" (p. 350.)

Ordinarily, the remedies are to be sought *direct* from the Great Physician. Nor are they far to seek; they are "nigh thee, even in thy mouth, and in thy heart." (Rom. 10 : 8 ; see also the next three verses.) "Reckon up, therefore," says St. Chrysostom, "the medicines which heal thy wounds, and apply all [not, *get the priest to apply them*] unremittingly, humbleness, confession, forgetting wrongs, giving thanks in afflictions, showing mercy both in alms and actions, persevering in prayer. . . . There is yet another way along with these, defending the oppressed ; for He saith (Isa. 1 : 17, 18), *Judge the fatherless, plead for the widow . . . though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow.* What excuse, then, can we deserve to have made for us if with so many ways leading us up to heaven, and so many medicines to heal our wounds, even after the Laver (of Baptism) we continue where we were?" (Hom. v. in 2 Cor. 2 : 12, 13.) Just before, he explains what the confession he here enumerates among the remedies is : "Groan when thou hast sinned . . . because thou hast offended thy Master. . . . For this, groan, and do this continually : *for this is confession.*" When we are in doubt about the remedy (which *ought not* to be often, and *will not* be, unless we are suffering from the effects of unskilful *treatment*) it is proper to seek the *advice* of a skilful under-physician ; and then, of course, so much of our complaint, and only so much, is to be disclosed as is necessary to enable him to give intelligent advice. If we shrink from *uncalled-for* exposure of the body to the physician of the body, much more should we shrink, unless in cases of extreme necessity—and such cases are extremely rare—from exposure of the soul except to the Great Physician, who

"Knows all, yet loves us better than He knows."

The Archbishop quotes Acts 19 : 18, which tells how

the Ephesians, *at the time of their conversion*, confessed *publicly* their previous heathenish practices (*πράξεις*) of “curious arts” of magic, and “brought their books together, and burned them before all men;” and 1 St. John 1 : 9, “If we confess our sins (namely to God), He is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness,” neither of which has any thing whatever to do with the subject in hand, and adds, “The strength of these texts of Scripture will appear to you much more forcible when you are told that all the Fathers of the Church, from the first to the last, insist upon the necessity of Sacramental Confession as a divine institution.” (p. 350.)

I should say in reply, reader, that these texts will appear to you much *less* forcible—only that I am sure that, even as it is, they don’t appear to you (for the purpose for which they are quoted) forcible at all—“when you are told,” as I now tell you, distinctly and categorically, “that all the Fathers of the Church, from the first to the last,” down to the time of Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome from 440 to 461, know nothing and say nothing of any such necessity. I distinctly challenge the Archbishop to produce out of the genuine writings—and I say *genuine* because Rome has a scent for spurious works like that of a buzzard for carrion—of the thirty-odd Fathers, Greek and Latin, who wrote before the time of Leo, one passage, only one, “insisting upon the necessity of Sacramental Confession as a divine institution.” Let him now do it, or else hereafter forever hold his peace. But observe, it is “Sacramental Confession” that is here in question. What that is, the Council of Trent shall inform us :

“SESSION XIV., CANON VI. If any one shall deny either that sacramental confession was instituted, or is necessary to salvation, of divine right; or shall say that the manner of confessing secretly to a priest alone,

which the Catholic Church hath ever observed from the beginning, and doth observe, is alien from the institution and command of Christ, and is a human invention ; let him be anathema.

“ CANON VII. If any one shall say that, in the sacrament of Penance, it is not, of divine right, necessary unto the remission of sins, to confess all and individually the deadly sins, the memory of which, after due and diligent previous meditation is held, even those which are secret and those which are opposed to the two last [our one last, to wit, the *tenth*] commandments of the Decalogue, as also the circumstances which change the species of a sin ; but [saith] that such confession is only useful to instruct and console the penitent, and that it was of old only observed in order to impose a canonical satisfaction ; . . . let him be anathema.

“ CANON VIII. If any one shall say that the confession of all sins, such as the Church observes, is impossible, and is a human tradition, to be abolished by the pious ; or that all and each of the faithful of Christ, of either sex, are not obliged thereunto once a year, according to the constitution of the great Council of Lateran, . . . let him be anathema.

“ CANON IX. If any one shall say that the sacramental absolution of the priest is not a judicial act, but a bare ministry of pronouncing and declaring sins to be remitted unto him who confesses ; . . . let him be anathema.”

“ As, according to the wise admonition of the Council of Trent, we cannot form an accurate judgment on any matter, or award to crime a just proportion of punishment, without having previously examined, and made ourselves well acquainted with the cause ; hence arises a necessity, on the part of the penitent, of making known to the priest, through the medium of confession, *each and every sin*. This doctrine, a doctrine defined by

the holy synod of Trent, the uniform doctrine of the Catholic Church, the pastor will teach." (*Catechism of the Council of Trent*, p. 255.)

"Sins of desire only, such as are forbidden by the ninth and tenth [our tenth] commandments, are all and each of them to be made matter of confession." (*Ibid.*, p. 258.)

"Hence, according to the most ancient practice of the Church, when penitents are absolved from their sins, some penance is imposed, the performance of which is commonly called 'satisfaction.'" (*Ibid.*, p. 266.)

"No person is to be absolved until he has first faithfully *promised* to repair fully the injury done" to his neighbor. (*Ibid.*, p. 273.)

"But in imposing penance . . . no satisfaction can be more salutary than to require of the penitent to devote, for a certain number of days, a certain portion of time to prayer." (*Ibid.*, p. 273.)*

From the foregoing extracts from the Canons of the Council of Trent (Buckley's Translation, which is almost servilely literal), and from the Catechism set forth by its authority, we see what "sacramental confession" is: it is (1) to a priest, (2) in private, (3) of secret sins, even those of *thought*, (4) compulsory, (5) for obtaining *private* absolution, (6) without *previous* and *public* penance—the penance being always *subsequent*, and *private*, (7) "of divine institution." This is the "Sacramental Confession," the necessity of which, the Archbishop says, all the Fathers insist upon. If the Confession in use in the early Church prior to Leo the Great lack any one of these seven characteristics, then it is not the "Sacramental Confession" now taught and enforced in and by the Roman Church.

Now there were but two kinds of confession in the

* Think of turning Prayer, which is "the Christian's vital breath," into Penance !!!

early Church ; the first was public, and consisted of acts rather than words, and lasted one, five, ten, twenty, even thirty years, and sometimes for a lifetime. It was for heinous and scandalous sins only, such as falling away from the faith under persecution, adultery, homicide, and such like. Tertullian has given an extended account of it in his treatise *De Penitentia* : God, saith he, “ hath placed in the porch a second repentance [Baptism being the first], which may open unto them that knock, but now for once only, because now for the second time, and never again, because at the last time in vain.” (c. vii.) And again : “ The more straitened, then, the work of this second and only remaining repentance, the more laborious its proof, so that it may not be only borne upon the conscience within, but may be also exhibited by some outward act. This act, which is better and more commonly expressed by a Greek word (*ἐξομολόγησις*), is Confession, whereby we acknowledge our sin to the Lord, not because He knoweth it not, but inasmuch as by confession satisfaction is ordered, from confession repentance springeth, by repentance God is appeased.” (c. ix.)

It will be seen that Tertullian speaks of this “ second repentance,” this *acted* confession, as “ placed in the porch.” In the arrangement of the ancient churches, there was commonly, before the church, an open area surrounded with porticoes, or sometimes only an open portico. This was the place in which the first and lowest order of penitents, the *weepers*, stood exposed to the weather. The church itself consisted usually of three divisions within. In the first, called the *narthex*, a narrow vestibule extending the whole width of the church (among Jews and heathen, heretics and schismatics, catechumens and energoumens as yet unbaptized), stood the second class of penitents, the *hearers*, who were allowed to hear the Scriptures read, and the

sermon preached, but had to depart before the Common Prayers began, which in the early Church *followed* the sermon. The next division, or main body of the church, was the *nave*, separated from the *narthex* by a wooden railing. Just within this railing were the third order of penitents, the *kneelers* or *prostrators*, so called because they were allowed to remain and join in certain prayers particularly made for them, whilst they were kneeling, or prostrate on the ground. In the rest of the nave were the believers or faithful, among whom were mingled the fourth order of penitents, the *co-standers* who *stood with* the faithful, and joined in the prayers after the other orders of penitents had been dismissed. At last, after they had gone through the prescribed time,* which varied according to the degree of the offence, some of them spending years in each of these orders, others only a brief period, they were by a public and formal absolution restored to full communion. The absolution was never given before the penance was accomplished, except to such as were dangerously ill, and these, if they recovered, were obliged to take their place again among the penitents till they had gone through the several stages. (See Hammond, *Six General Councils*, from whose Note to Canon XI. of the Council of Nice I have abridged most of the foregoing account.) In all this, there is nothing at all resembling the "Sacramental Confession" of the modern Roman Church.

The second, and only other, kind of confession in the early Church (except, of course, that of Christians "confessing their faults one to another and to God,") was private, but it was not compulsory, nor was it ever accompanied with private absolution; still less, with private penance *following* such absolution. "There was a very early Practice," says Marshall (*Penitential*

* This was sometimes shortened by an *Indulgence*, of which more in the next chapter.

Discipline of the Primitive Church, (p. 44,) London, 1714), “ of *voluntary* Confession, which was sometimes *publick*, and sometimes *private* only ; of both which we meet with Testimonies approaching so near the Fountain that they almost mix with it.” He then cites “ some noble passages” from Origen, Tertullian, and Cyprian, and, on page 52, continues thus :

“ It is true, indeed, that all who mention the Confession of *secret* Sins do it still with some Eye of Reference to *publick* Discipline. (This Origen, Tertullian, and St. Cyprian do all, as far as I can judge, agree in :) But then it is likewise certain, that *publick Discipline* was not assign’d to every Sin, which was thus in *private confess’d* ; but only to such as, upon a view of the Case, were conceiv’d to need it. The Party therefore who thus confess’d his *private* Offences, must have open’d them at large, or else the Penitentiary could not judge of them whether they needed such a Cure or no. If they did not, then the Party had the Comfort [not of Absolution, but] of that Presbyter’s Opinion, that he might be safe without it, and *Ghostly Advice* moreover, how to behave in the Conduct of his future Life ; and upon this, in Process of Time, was grafted the Practice of *private Penance*, when the Zeal of Men grew too cold for a Submission to the *Publick*.”

Origen, in one of the “ noble Passages” cited by Marshall, advises those who would confess in private, to “ be careful in chusing a fit Person, to whom they may open their Minds with Profit and Advantage ; that they try to find out such a spiritual Physician, as knows how to mourn with them that mourn, to be weak with them who are weak ; in fine, to be tender and compassionate, and such an one (upon the whole) as having approv’d his skill to them, may give them Reason to depend upon his Council, and to follow it ; that so, if

he shall judge their Case to be, what may need the Cure of a publick Animadversion, and deserve to be laid open in the Face of the Church (*qui in conventu totius Ecclesiæ exponi debeat et curari*), for the Edification either of themselves or others, this may be done deliberately and discreetly, and agreeably to the Directions of such an approv'd Physician." (In *Psal.* 37 (38). *Hom.* 2.)

From this we learn that what was deemed wanting, in such a case, in Origen's day was a spiritual physician qualified to give (not private absolution, which was then unknown, but) sound (spiritual) medical advice, and that the sin-sick soul was free to choose its own physician. This liberty was afterward abridged by the appointment by each Bishop of a *Penitentiary Presbyter*, "whose duty," says Socrates (*Ecccl. Hist.* v. 19), "it should be to receive the confession of penitents who had sinned after baptism;" and he says it was first done "when the Novatians separated themselves from the Church because they would not communicate with those who had lapsed during the persecution under Decius;" *i.e.*, about A.D. 250. This continued till about 390, when, in consequence of a scandal to which it had given occasion in the Constantinopolitan Church, ecclesiastics being subjected to taunting and reproach, "Endæmon," says Socrates, "a presbyter of the Church, by birth an Alexandrian, persuaded Nectarius the Bishop to abolish the office of penitentiary presbyter, and to leave every one to his own conscience with regard to the participation of the sacred mysteries," *i.e.*, the holy communion. That this last statement of Socrates is correct, we may be sure, for he says, "I myself heard the explanation of the matter from Endæmon;" and he adds: "My observation to Endæmon, when he first related the circumstance, was this: 'Whether, O presbyter, your counsel has been profitable for the Church or otherwise, God knows; but I see that it

takes away the means of rebuking another's faults, and prevents our acting upon that precept of the Apostle, *Have no fellowship with the unfruitful works of darkness, but rather reprove them.*" Sozomen (*Eccl. Hist.* vii. 16) gives the same account of the "suppression of this office in the Church," and adds, "This example was followed by the Bishops of every region." I add, that there was but one penitentiary presbyter to a diocese, even the great city of Constantinople having but one; for, says Sozomen (*ut supra*), "At Constantinople, a presbyter was always appointed to preside over the penitents, until," etc., and then goes on to give an account of the scandal that occasioned the abolition of the office.

From the foregoing account two conclusions follow: *first*, that confession to a priest as a condition to the partaking of the Holy Communion was exceptional not universal, or even general, for it would have been physically impossible for one presbyter to hear habitually, or even once a year, the confessions of all the communicants of a diocese; and, *secondly*, that confession to a priest in private was not then considered of divine authority and therefore of universal and perpetual obligation, for had it been, Nectarius would not have dared to abolish it, and "*leave every one to his own conscience with regard to the participation of the sacred mysteries;*" nor if he had, would his "example" have been "followed by the Bishops of every region." Nectarius and the other Bishops evidently understood that they were simply returning to the rule of St. Paul (1 Cor, 11 : 28), "Let a man examine himself, and so (that is, after having examined himself, *not*, after having been examined by another) let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup." Rome's rule, on the contrary, is, Let him *not* "eat of that bread"—I use the words of her own Version—except another, and that other a priest, have first examined him, and let him not drink

of that cup at all. And this rule (of examination by *another*), the Archbishop has the assurance to tell us, is primitive and Apostolic ; for he says (p. 358)—and he *italicizes* it—that “ Sacramental Confession *was not instituted since the time of the Apostles*. Really, he ought to be satisfied with browbeating his contemporaries, without undertaking to browbeat the Apostle Paul !

But, says the Archbishop, “ We are not unfrequently told . . . that Sacramental Confession was not introduced into the Church until 1,200 years after the time of our Saviour. [Will he have the goodness to inform us *when*, before that date, and *where*, and *by whom*, it was made compulsory on all communicants everywhere, and give us chapter and verse ?] In vindication of their bold assertion [“ bold assertion,” from *him*, is good], they even introduce quotations from SS. Basil, Ambrose, Augustine, Jerome, and Chrysostom. These quotations are utterly irrelevant ; but if seen in the context [mark that, reader, for I am going to show you, presently, a specimen of the Archbishop’s idea of *context*, that will make you open your eyes *wide*], they will tend to prove, instead of disproving, the Catholic [yes, but not the Roman] doctrine of Confession. For the sake of brevity [“ brevity’s the soul of wit,” but not always of truth], I shall cite a few passages only from the Fathers referred to. These citations I take, almost at random [*quite* “ at random,” the reader will think, before he gets through with them], from the copious writings of these Fathers on Confession. [The “ writings of these Fathers on Confession” are “ copious,” but the “ Confession” is *not* “ Sacramental.”] From these extracts you can judge of the sentiments of all the Fathers on the subject of Confession. “ *Ab uno disce omnes.*” ” (p. 351.)

The Archbishop’s first “ extract” is from St. Basil, Bishop of Cæsarea in Cappadocia from 370 to 379 ; and that it may be (to use the Archbishop’s phrase

above quoted) "seen in the context," I shall here give, in parallel columns, the Archbishop's presentation of the Saint, and the Benedictine presentation of him; merely premising that the Benedictine Edition is recognized by all scholars, Roman and non-Roman, as the Standard Edition :

BENEDICTINE :

"Q. 229. Whether forbidden actions ought to be laid open, *citra verecundiam*, to all, or to whom, and of what sort ?

"A. The discovering of sins has the same rules as the making known of bodily ailments : as then men do not reveal the ailments of the body to all, but to those skilled in their cure, so also the discovery of sins ought to be made to those able to cure them, as it is written (Rom. 15 : 1), *Ye, then, that are strong, bear the infirmities of the weak, i.e., by care remove them*" (p. 452).

[Between this and what follows, there is a space of *only* twenty-four folio pages of the Benedictine edition !!!]

"Q. 288. Whether he who wishes to confess his sins ought to confess them to all, or to any chance persons (*quibuslibet*), or to whom ?

"A. . . . Sins must be confessed to those who have been put in trust with the mysteries of God. For thus they also are found to have done who of old did penance *in the presence of the saints* (*ἐπὶ τῶν ἁγίων, coram sanctis*). For it is written (*in Evangelio quidem*) in the Gospel (St. Matt. iii.), that they confessed their sins to *John the Baptist* ; (*in actis vero*), and in the Acts, to the Apostles *themselves*, by whom also they were baptized" (p. 516).

ARCHBISHOP'S :

"St. Basil writes : ' In the confession of sins, the same method must be observed as in laying open the infirmities of the body ; for as these are not rashly communicated to every one, but to those only who understand by what method they may be cured, so the confession of sins must be made to such persons as have the power to apply a remedy.* Necessarily, our sins must be confessed to those to whom has been committed the dispensation of the mysteries of God. For thus also are they found to have acted who did penance of old, *in regard of the saints*. For it is written in the Acts, they confessed to the Apostles, by whom also they were baptized ' † " (p. 351).

* Here come in the twenty-four folio pages.

† "In Reg. Brev., p. 516."

The first of the two answers that the Archbishop,

quietly (for there are no *stars*, or other indication of any omission) ignoring twenty-four folio pages, here brings together (thereby practically solving affirmatively the famous problem of the Schoolmen, whether angels can pass from one point of space to another without passing through the intermediate points) relates to the disclosing of spiritual ailments not by the laity to the clergy, but by the weak to the strong, whether clergy or laity, as the citation from Rom. 15 : 1, which the Archbishop *prudently* omits, unmistakably shows, "the weak" and "the strong" having been clearly pointed out by the Apostle in the preceding chapter, to wit, the fourteenth. The other answer of the Saint, twenty-four pages further on, relates to *public* confession, as the reference to John the Baptist, which the Archbishop also prudently omits, most plainly demonstrates, and as is shown likewise by the Greek phrase above given, which the Benedictine Editors rightly translate, *coram sanctis*, i.e., *in the presence of the saints*, but which the Archbishop *inadvertently* renders, "in regard of the saints." It is a great misfortune when a man's mistakes all tend in the same direction, and conspire to the same end : it tends to unsettle confidence in the mathematical doctrine of "chances," or, as the better phrase is, "quantity of belief." In one thing I am sure we shall all agree with the Archbishop, namely, in the importance of "quotations from SS. Basil, Ambrose," etc., being "seen in the context," or, if that is *inconvenient*, not more, at the farthest, than twenty-four folio pages away from it.

The Archbishop prefaces his extract from St. Basil with, "*Ab uno disce omnes :*" *From one learn all :* which means that his quotation from St. Basil is a fair specimen of his other quotations. Whether his first quotation from St. Ambrose is made up of *dissecta membra* twenty-four folio pages apart from each other, is more than I can say, as he gives no other reference than

“ See Faith of Catholics, Vol. III., p. 74, and seq., ” and I *can't* “ see ” it, as it is not visible in this latitude. I have searched carefully through the four volumes of Migne's Edition of St. Ambrose, with the help of tolerably full Indexes, and have been unable to find it. I shall therefore content myself with remarking that the reference, like that in the next extract, which I *have* succeeded in finding, is undoubtedly to *public* confession, the “ shame ” of which (“ Art thou ashamed? This shame will avail thee little at the judgment seat of God ”) is tenfold more powerful as a drawback than that of the *private* confession of the Roman Church.

I said, I have succeeded in finding the Archbishop's second extract—the one which he says “ clearly shows that the great Light of the Church of Milan is speaking of confession to priests,” and I here add that I have also succeeded in finding—what the Archbishop *didn't* succeed in finding—the paragraph *immediately* preceding ; the last two sentences of which, together with the first sentence of the Archbishop's extract, runs thus in the original Latin : “ Nam plerique futuri suplicii metu peccatorum suorum conscii, penitentiam petunt, et cum acceperint, *publicæ supplicationis revocantur pudore*. Hi videntur malorum petiisse pœnitentiam agere bonorum.

“ Nounulli ideo poscunt poenitentiam, ut statim sibi reddi communionem velint. Hi non tam se solvere cupiunt, quam sacerdotem ligare,” etc. (*De Poenit.* l. ii. c. 9, par. 86, 87. Migne, t. xvi. col. 517.)

In the first of these St. Ambrose tells us that “ many, conscious of their sins, through fear of future punishment, ask for penance, and after they have accepted it, *draw back through shame of the public supplication.* ” In the second he tells us, in the translation given by the Archbishop, that “ there are some who ask for penance, that they may at once be restored to communion. These do not so much desire to be loosed as to bind the priest ; for they do not unburden their conscience, but

they burden his, who is commanded not to give holy things unto dogs—that is, not easily to admit impure souls to the holy communion” (p. 352). In both cases, the penance which is, of course, imposed by the Priest, or the Bishop, is *public*, and the “loosing,” after the penance is accomplished, is by the Priest, or the Bishop, and is *public* also. The “public supplication,” spoken of in the first of the two paragraphs, is referred to again in paragraph 92: “Let your mother the Church weep for you, and lave your fault with her tears; let Christ see you weeping, that He may say: *Blessed are ye that weep now, for ye shall laugh* (St. Luke 6: 21). He loves to see many praying for one: *amat ut pro uno multi rogent.*”

“Paulinus, the secretary of St. Ambrose, in his life of that great Bishop [prefixed to Migne’s Edition of his works], relates that he used to weep over the penitents whose confessions he heard.”

Yes, and the context, and the *Catechism of the Council of Trent*, will tell us why he wept so; namely, because he found it so hard to induce them to submit to the shame and the severity of the *public* penance. Says the *Catechism* (p. 269, Murphy’s First American Edition), “But with regard to public sinners, they, as we have already said, were never absolved until they had performed public penance. Meanwhile, the pastor poured out his prayers to God for their salvation, and ceased not to exhort them to do the same. This salutary practice gave active employment to the zeal and solicitude of St. Ambrose; many, who came to the tribunal of penance hardened in sin, were by his tears softened into true contrition. *Paulinus in ejus vita.*”

“St. Augustine writes: ‘Our merciful God wills us to confess in this world that we may not be confounded in the other.’ *Hom. xx.*”

I have not been able to find it by this reference, but it is of no consequence, for there is nothing here to

determine whether the confession is to man, or to God—in public, or in private ; the sole points at issue.

The Archbishop gives another extract from St. Augustine, but as he, *again inadvertently*, omits three or four lines immediately preceding, which are important to the correct understanding of the passage, I will supply the omission, merely premising that the Sermon (Serm. 392) from which it is taken is *Ad conjugatos*, “To Married People,” and that the part containing the extract is addressed to husbands :

“Qui post uxores vestras vos illicito concubitu maculastis, si præter uxores vestras cum aliqua concubuitis ; aqite pœnitentian, qualis aqitur in Ecclesia, ut oret pro vobis Ecclesia.* Nemo sibi dicat, Occulte ago, apud Deum ago,” etc. ; *i.e.*, “Ye who have defiled yourselves by adultery, do penance, *as it is done in the Church*, that the Church may pray for you.* Let no one say, to himself, I do penance to God in private, I do it before God. Is it then in vain that Christ hath said, ‘Whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven?’ Is it in vain that the keys have been given to the Church? Do we make void the Gospel? void the words of Christ?” (p. 352).

“In this extract,” continues the Archbishop, “how well doth the great Doctor meet the sophistry of those who, in our times, say that it is sufficient to confess to God!” To which I add, “In this extract,” uncurtailed of its fair proportions, “how well doth the great Doctor meet” the *inadvertence* of those who, in our day, by the omission, “for the sake of brevity” (p. 351), *of two lines and a half*, turn public penance for adultery into private penance for a violation of the tenth commandment!! “The great Doctor’s” interpretation of the “power of the keys,” of “binding,” and “loosing,” as here given, is exactly that of our

* Here the omitted part ends, and the Archbishop’s extract begins.

Thirty-third Article :* “ That person which by open denunciation of the Church is rightly cut off from the unity of the Church, and excommunicated, ought to be taken of the whole multitude of the faithful, as an Heathen and Publican, until he be *openly reconciled by penance*, and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto”—in other words, that hath the “ power of the keys ;” the power of “ binding,” and, as a consequence thereof, of “ loosing.”

The Archbishop next quotes from the “ thirtieth Homily” of St. Chrysostom ; from which one would suppose that his Homilies are numbered in one series only, instead of being numbered, as they really are, in separate series for the separate books of Scripture. In the present instance, it is the thirtieth Homily on Genesis. In it we are exhorted to “ exhibit,” during the closing days of Lent, “ a *full and accurate confession of our sins*. . . . For . . . having confessed our sins, and *shown* our wounds to the *physician*, we attain to an abundant cure” (p. 353). Here, by *inadvertently* (it is wonderful how inadvertent some people are) *italicizing* certain words, as given above, and beginning *physician* with a small *p*, the Archbishop leads the reader off the track, away from the Great Physician, of whom

* The following, from his Lectures to Catechumens on the Creed is absolutely conclusive : “ Once we are washed by Baptism, daily we are washed by prayer. But take care not to commit those sins for which you will have to be separated from the body of Christ. That be far from you. For they whom you see doing penance have committed crimes, either adultery, or some other grievous offence ; and for these they are doing penance. For if their sins were light, daily prayer would suffice to blot them out.” Semel abluimur Baptismate, quotidie abluimur oratione. Sed nolite illa committere, pro quibus necesse est ut a Christi corpore separemini : quod absit a vobis. Illi enim quos videtis agere poenitentiam, scelera commiserunt, aut adulteria, aut aliqua facta immania : inde agunt poenitentiam. Nam si levia peccata ipsorum essent, ad haec quotidiana oratio delenda sufficeret.—August *De Symbolo ad Catechumenos*. c. 7, Migne., tom II. (Aug. t. vi.) col. 636. From this, it is plain that, in St. Augustine’s day, the remedies for sin were two : daily prayer, and the public penance and absolution ; he knew of no intermediate private penance and absolution.

St. Chrysostom's thoughts were full, to the little physician, the priest, who, as we shall see by and by (further on, p. 348), wasn't in his thoughts at all.

For his next quotation from St. Chrysostom, the Archbishop gives the general reference "Tom. vii., Comm. in Matt.," which necessitates a *search* for it till it is found. The passage, as he gives it, runs thus : "Do not *confess to me* only of fornication, nor of those things that are manifest among all men, but bring together also thy secret calumnies, and evil speakings . . . and all such things."

If the Archbishop had begun "*me*" with a capital, "Do not confess to Me only of fornication," etc., the reader would have seen at once that St. Chrysostom was putting the words into the mouth of God. But that is the very thing the Archbishop denies : "The great Doctor," he says, "plainly enjoins here a detailed and specific confession of our sins not to God, but to His minister, as the whole context evidently shows" (p. 353). Why, then, doesn't he give the context? If it does show that, then it is in flat contradiction with passage after passage, in other parts of St. Chrysostom's works, some of which I will give before I get through. See further on, page 348.

The Archbishop next adduces three passages from St. Chrysostom's treatise on the Priesthood in which he extols the power of Christ's priests as compared with that of parents and of kings, in that we receive our natural birth from our parents, our baptismal new birth from the priest, as also the sacrament of Christ's body and blood ; our parents also, he says, cannot restore to us our lost health, but the priests can, by "praying over us and anointing us with oil in the name of the Lord ;" of which more when I come to the chapter on Extreme Unction. The three passages are as follows :

"To the priests is given a power which God would

not grant either to angels or archangels ; insomuch that what the priests do below, God ratifies above, and the Master confirms the sentence of His servants. For, He says, ' Whose sins you shall retain, they are retained.'

" What power, I ask, can be greater than this ? The Father hath given all power to the Son ; and I see all this same power delivered to them by God the Son.

" To cleanse the leprosy of the body, or rather to pronounce it cleansed, was given to the Jewish priests alone. But to our Priests is granted the power not of declaring healed the leprosy of the body, but of absolutely cleansing the defilements of the soul."

See the second extract from St. Jerome, further on.

There is one more passage from St. Chrysostom. I give it in the Archbishop's translation, and in the correct translation in the long Note on Confession in Dodgson's *Tertullian* (Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1842, p. 387):

DODGSON'S.

" He who has done these things [grievous sins], if he would use the assistance of conscience for his need, and hasten to confess his sin, and show his sore to the Physician, Who healeth and reproacheth not, and converse with Him alone, none knowing, and tell all exactly, he shall soon amend his falls. For confession of sins is the effacing of offences (Hom. xx. in Gen., § 3."

THE ARCHBISHOP'S.

" If a sinner, as becomes him, would use the aid of his conscience, and hasten to confess his crimes, and disclose his ulcer to his physician, who may heal and not reproach, and receive remedies from him ; if he would speak to him alone, without the knowledge of any one, and with care lay all before him, easily would he amend his failings ; *for the confession of sins is the absolution of crimes* (Hom. xx.)

The reader will here see how, by a slight change at the beginning, a *grievous sinner* is changed into *any sinner*, and the great Physician, by the pronoun *his* and the subjunctive *may heal* instead of the article *the* and

the indicative *healeth*, into the little physician, the priest.

“St. Jerome writes : ‘ If the serpent, the devil, secretly bite a man, and thus infect him with the poison of sin, and this man shall remain silent, and do not penance, nor be willing to make known his wound to his brother and master ; the master [and brother] who has [who have] a tongue that can heal, cannot [*plural*], easily serve him [*magister et frater, qui linguam habent ad curandum, facile ei prodesse non poterunt*].* For if the ailing man be ashamed to open his case to the physician, no cure can be expected ; for medicine does not cure that of which it knows nothing.’ Comment. in Eccles. [X. 8]” (p. 354). The words here commented on are, “ Whoso breaketh an hedge, a serpent shall bite him ;” and a spiritual lesson is *suggested* by them to the commentator, to wit, that he who is bitten by the serpent of sin, should seek the *advice* of spiritual physicians. St. Jerome evidently had a reason for adding the words “ and brother,” and putting the verbs in the plural ; and the Archbishop as evidently had a reason for leaving out those words, and putting the verb in the singular.

St. Jerome, in his comment on St. Matt. 16 : 19, *I will give thee the keys*, etc., as given in the English translation of the *Catena Aurea* of St. Thomas Aquinas (Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1841), which I have compared with the original in Migne, and find to be literal, says : “ Bishops and Presbyters, not understanding this passage, assume to themselves something of the lofty pretensions (*supercilio*) of the Pharisees, and suppose that they may either condemn the innocent or absolve the guilty ; whereas what will be enquired into before the Lord will not be the sentence of the Priests, but the life of him that is being judged. We read in Leviticus of the lepers, how they are commanded to show them-

* Migne, *Patrologia*, tom. xxiii., col. 1096.

selves to the Priests ; and if they have the leprosy, then they are made unclean by the Priest ; not that the Priest makes them leprous and unclean, but that the Priest has knowledge of what is leprosy and what is not leprosy, and can discern who is clean, and who is unclean. In the same way then as there the Priest makes the leper unclean, *here* the Bishop or *Presbyter* binds or looses not those who are without sin, or guilt, but *in discharge of his function* when he has heard the varieties of their sins, he knows who is to be bound, and who loosed."

The Archbishop gives (p. 355) a part of the last sentence thus :

" *With us*, the Bishop or *priest* binds or looses ; not them who are *merely* innocent or guilty, but (having heard, *as his duty requires*, the various qualities of sin), he understands who should be bound and who loosed."

The Archbishop *italicizes* the part I have enclosed in parentheses, to draw special attention to it. I have indicated by *italics* his alterations and additions. He hadn't room for more ; but as he likes to have things "*seen in the context*" (p. 351), he will be obliged to me for having supplied his "lack of service."

St. Chrysostom, in the passage last but one cited from him, *seems* to differ from St. Jerome here, on the comparative power of the Jewish and the Christian priest ; but the difference is one of seeming, rather than of reality. St. Jerome is speaking of *judicial* absolution, in "the *external* forum ;" St. Chrysostom, of *ministerial* absolution, in "the *internal* forum." At any rate, Rome canonizes them both, and, in the words of Tertullian (*De Præscript.* xxiv.), though he is speaking of Apostles, "I am not good man enough, or rather I am not bad man enough, to set" two Saints of the Roman Calendar "the one against the other."

The Archbishop having at last got through with his

quotations from the Fathers, to every one of which I have paid my respects, asks triumphantly, in reference to his last one from St. Jerome : " Could the Catholic doctrine regarding the power of the priests and the obligation of confession be expressed in stronger language than this ? " Whether the *Catholic* doctrine could or not, the *Roman* doctrine certainly could.

" And yet," continues the Archbishop, " these are the very Fathers who are represented to be opposed to Sacramental Confession ! With a reckless disregard ["reckless," from the Archbishop, is good] of the unanimous voice of antiquity [not the faintest *whisper* of which, if it exist, has he yet produced], our adversaries have the hardihood ["*hardihood*" is good] to assert that private or Sacramental Confession was introduced at a period subsequent to the twelfth century. They do not, however, vouchsafe to inform us by what Pope or Bishop or Father of the Church [there has been no " Father of the Church " since the twelfth century ; St. Bernard was " the last of the Fathers "], or by what Council, or in what country, this monstrous innovation [he is right there ; it is " monstrous "] was foisted on the Christian Republic " (p. 355).

As the Archbishop is anxious for information, he shall have it ; and from one to whom he can't very well refuse to listen : I mean Cardinal Wiseman. But first let me recall *his* witnesses, for examination in chief ; hitherto we have been cross-examining them.

Call St. Basil.—What say you ? Is the Archbishop right or wrong ?

Wrong. " I do not confess with the lips, that I may be made manifest to people, but within, in the very heart, closing my eye, I show the groanings within me to Thee only, Who seest in secret, roaring within myself." *Hom. in Psal. 37* (our 38) : 8.

Call St. Ambrose.—What say you ? Is the Archbishop right or wrong ?

Wrong. "Let tears wash away the guilt which one is *ashamed to confess with the voice*. Tears consult both for pardon and for modesty. Tears express the fault without alarm; tears confess the sin, *without injuring bashfulness*; tears obtain the pardon they ask not for."—*In Luc. lib. x. c. 88. Migne, t. xv. col. 1825.*

Call St. Augustine.—What say you? Is the Archbishop right or wrong?

Wrong. "What have I to do with men that they should hear my confessions, as if they could heal (*sana-turi sint*) all my diseases?" *Confess. lib. x. c. 3.*

Call St. Chrysostom.—What say you? Is the Archbishop right or wrong?

Wrong. "Why art thou ashamed and blushest to tell thy sins? Tellest thou them to man, that he may reproach thee? Confessest thou to thy fellow-servant, that he may make a show of thee? Thou showest thy wound to the Lord, Who careth for thee, the Friend, the Physician" (*Hom. iv. De Lazaro, § 4*). "I do not bring thee into any theatre of thy fellow-servants, nor compel thee to reveal thy sins to men; unfold thy conscience to God, and to Him show thy wounds, *and of Him ask the remedies*; show them to Him who reproacheth not, but healeth" (*Hom. v. De Incomprehens. Dei nat. § 7*). "Within, in the conscience, *none being present except the All-seeing God*, enter into judgment and examination of sins, and reviewing thy whole life bring thy sins into the judgment of thy mind; correct thy transgressions; and *thus with a pure conscience, touch the Holy Table and partake of the Holy Sacrifice.*" *Hom. De Pœnit vi. fin.*

Thus all five of the Archbishop's witnesses, on their cross-examination, fail to sustain him; and four out of the five, on being summoned on the other side and examined in chief, testify point blank against him.

Let us now call Cardinal Wiseman into court, and see what information he can give the Archbishop on

the origin of the different parts of the Roman "Sacrament of Penance." I have lying before me his *Lectures on the principal Doctrines and Practices of the Catholic Church*; in two volumes: First American, from the First London Edition. Philadelphia: Eugene Cumiskey, 1837. On page 17 of volume ii. he brings forward two witnesses of the second century, St. Irenæus and Tertullian; whereas all the Archbishop's witnesses are of the latter half of the fourth. Here is what he quotes, and all he quotes, from Irenæus: "Some, touched in conscience, publicly confessed their sins; while others, in despair, renounced their faith. *Adv. Hær. c. xiii.*" On this he thus comments: "Look at this alternative; some confessed, and others renounced, the faith. If there were any other means of forgiveness, why should they have abandoned their faith?" Now as Irenæus says expressly that the confession was *public*, and as the Cardinal's question implies that there was no other means of forgiveness, it is plain that in Irenæus's day such sins as they confessed could not be forgiven on *private* confession. He then gives an extract from Tertullian, the same that I have already given on page 331, and adds: "This is said with reference, more or less, to the public practice." These two quotations he introduces with this paragraph.

"I now proceed to read you passages from these ancient fathers, and I will not come later than 400 years after Christ; because, after that time, the texts increase immensely. I will divide them into two classes. I will give you one or two where confession in general—that is, public confession—is alluded to; for they will show the feeling of the church, as to its being the only means of obtaining forgiveness." He then gives the two quotations just mentioned, and one other from Tertullian, on the *necessity* of such *public* confession in certain cases. He gives no instance of private, Sacramen-

tal Confession from the second century, for the very good reason that he can't find any ; if he could have found so much as one, he would have been only too happy to have brought it forward.

At what time, then, did private confession take the place of the public? I answer, It *began* to take the place of it under Leo the Great, Bishop of Rome from 440 to 461, who in his letter to the Bishops of Campania ordered the substitution of the one for the other. The *penance*, however, continued, long after, to be public, as did also the absolution that followed upon it. When and how the penance became private, the Cardinal shall inform us : " The public penance has disappeared from the Church not in consequence of any formal abolition, but from the relaxation of discipline, and from the change of habits, particularly in the west, caused by the invasion of the northern tribes. *Theodore of Canterbury* [A.D. 668-693] *was the first who introduced the practice of secret penance*, and in the eighth century the custom became general, of substituting prayer, alms, or other works of charity, for the rigorous course of expiation prescribed in the ancient church. It was not till the thirteenth that the practice of public penance completely ceased" (p. 65). This was the very century in which the Fourth Council of Lateran (A.D. 1215) made private confession to a priest, at least once a year, *compulsory* on all the faithful who had attained to years of discretion.

The Archbishop says it was compulsory before ; that is, compulsory (not on communities of monks, for instance, but—for that is the point at issue—) on all the faithful, and as a *conditio sine qua non* of receiving the Holy Communion. Let him show it, if he can. His declaration isn't proof : unfortunately, owing to his *inadvertences*, it isn't even presumptive evidence. We have seen that St. Paul says, " Let a man examine himself "—not, let the priest examine him—" and so

let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup." We have seen that St. Chrysostom the Bishop of the Imperial City Constantinople, "New Rome," at the beginning of the fifth century, says, in the last quotation from him, "Within, in the conscience, none being present except the All-seeing God, enter into judgment and examination of sins, . . . and *thus* . . . partake of the Holy Sacrifice." It is clear, then, that within the jurisdiction of the Bishop of Constantinople, at the beginning of the fifth century, private confession to a priest as a condition precedent to the reception of the Holy Communion was unknown. Equally unknown, according to Cardinal Wiseman's testimony above-cited, was the private penance till the middle of the seventh century. And *both* of these are *essential parts* of the "Sacrament of Penance." Yet the Archbishop devotes four pages (356-359) to showing that that "sacrament" *could not* have originated subsequently to the time of the Apostles. To all which, I answer, with Alice in the play, I never said it *could*; I only said it *did*: and in that, St. Chrysostom and Cardinal Wiseman say with me. Well does Dr. Pusey, in his *Letter to the Rev. W. N. Richards*, Oxford, J. H. Parker, 1850 after quoting (p. 145) two passages from St. Basil—the two the Archbishop lumps into one—add (p. 146):

"Far more remarkable than any such passages is the entire omission of the mention of private confession, or of any rule about it, or any restriction whatever as to making or receiving it. Had the present Latin discipline been that of the Ancient Church, it is impossible that we should have no traces of it, no indication whatever of these rules, of which, since the Council of Lateran, there is such frequent mention."

I add, had the present Roman doctrine of "Sacramental Confession" been that of the Church of the first

four centuries, it is impossible that there should have been absolutely no *Manuals* for the guidance of Father Confessors, such as those which swarm in the Roman Church of the last four centuries.

The remaining twenty-four pages of the Archbishop's chapter on this subject of Penance and Confession is, for the most part, taken, for substance, from his "Reply" to Bishop Atkinson's *Charge on Sacramental Confession, delivered . . . to the Clergy of his Diocese, in St. John's Church, Wilmington (N. C.), May 22d, 1874*. A "Refutation" of this "Reply" of the Archbishop has since been published by Bishop Atkinson. Of this I shall avail myself in what little needs here by said on these twenty-four pages.

The Archbishop (who was at the time plain Bishop Gibbons, of Richmond, having in charge also the members of the Roman Communion in North Carolina) gives (pp. 360-364) the teaching of a catechism put forth by "the Rev. C. S. Grueber, a clergyman of the Church of England," and contrasts it with that of Bishop Atkinson. To this, Bishop Atkinson replies :

"Bishop Gibbons is of the opinion that my teaching does not harmonize with that of the Rev. Mr. Grueber, of the Church of England. In this, I am sure, he is right ; but it does not unsettle my faith, that I should differ from Mr. Grueber. He is just one of that class of persons against whom my 'Charge' was directed.

"The bishop is disturbed by the spectacle of the same Church teaching diametrically opposite doctrines. I would, however, comfort him by pointing out that I am not the Church, nor is Mr. Grueber. And that I do not claim to be infallible, nor do I admit him to be so ; and that we are merely two ministers of the Church who hold and teach different views on a certain question. Does this seem very shocking to the excellent Bishop of Richmond? What would he say, then, to

the contradictory teachings of St. Augustine and St. Chrysostom on the subjects of Predestination and Free-will?" (pp. 24, 25).

Bishop Atkinson then goes on to contrast the assertion of Dr. (now Cardinal) Newman, in his Letter to the Duke of Norfolk regarding the Syllabus, "Any how, it is not the Pope, and I do not see my way to accept it for what it is not"—and again, "The Syllabus is not an official act"—with the declaration of "Archbishop Manning, the head of the Anglo-Roman Church, in his Pastoral to his Clergy in 1867," that "the Encyclical and Syllabus" are "a part of the supreme and infallible teaching of the Church, both in the Declarations and in the Condemnations contained in them." I wish I had room for the whole of this portion of the pamphlet, but must content myself with referring the reader to it.

The Archbishop "cannot well conceive why a Protestant Episcopalian should repudiate the pardoning power, which is plainly asserted in his standard Prayer-Book" (p. 364). I have already shown (pp. 323, 324) that we do not repudiate it, but are in the constant exercise of it. Let us hear Bishop Atkinson on this point :

"Bishop Gibbons is of the opinion—certainly without knowing much about it—that I have never heard a confession or given Absolution. . . . If he mean that I have never pronounced Absolution to the truly penitent and believing, then he is egregiously mistaken ; for this I am doing every week of my life.

"Again, if he mean by saying that I have never heard a confession, that I never heard such a one as is enjoined by the Council of Trent, then, again, he is in the right ; and few things would pain me more than even to be tempted to have it otherwise. But, if he mean that I never heard a confession of sin made

to relieve the conscience, and to procure guidance for the conduct, confession made secretly, and never to be divulged, and of sins which, if divulged, would not only have entailed shame and anguish, but very probably have caused bloodshed—confessions which I keep as sacredly as any Roman Catholic Priest can those made to him—then he is entirely mistaken, and shows himself unacquainted with the duties of a Priest of the Anglican Church.

“The difference, in this particular, between such a Priest and one of his Communion is, that *we* do not require confession of all persons, however pure their lives, however quiet their consciences ; that we do not suggest sins to those who, perhaps otherwise, might not have thought of them ; that we do not make confession a condition of communion ; that we do not require a disclosure of all sins, whether of thought, word, or deed, with all their circumstances. Confession of that sort we do, with great unanimity, reject, as being unauthorized and pernicious” (pp. 28, 29).

All the Archbishop's comment, therefore, on page 365 of his “little volume,” is only so much rigmarole. We have as much power as he has : he has no more power than we have. We can, and do, retain and remit sins, judicially, in the external forum, by admitting, or declining to admit, to the Holy Communion ; by suspending therefrom, and restoring thereto ; and he can do no more. We can, and do, retain and remit sins, ministerially, in the internal forum, by *pronouncing* absolved the penitent and believing, and declining to pronounce absolved the impenitent and unbelieving ; and the Archbishop himself can do no more. All the Archbishops in Romandom, with the Infallible Pope at their head, cannot absolve, in the internal forum, an impenitent unbelieving sinner : all the Archbishops in Romandom, with the Infallible Pope at their head, can-

not keep unabsolved, in the internal forum, a penitent believer. Moreover, the "power of the keys" belongs to the kingdom of heaven here only; not to the kingdom of heaven hereafter. All the Archbishops in Romandom, with the Infallible Pope at their head, cannot put a man into purgatory, or let him out of it; and the pretension to any such power, by whomsoever put forth, is only a huge imposture.

The Archbishop repeats on page 368 the quotation on page 352 from St. Augustine, and with the same mutilation; for my exposure of it, the reader is referred to page 341 above.

The Archbishop appeals to Statistics of Crime (by way of offset to Statistics quoted in Bishop Atkinson's "Charge") as a test of the value of the Confessional. I append a few counter-statistics from Bishop Atkinson's Rejoinder.* But I have a practical test to propose, worth more than all the Statistics of Christendom. Let the Archbishop confess to a Priest the "negligences and ignorances" and *inadvertences* with which, as I have shown, his "little volume" swarms, and let the Priest impose on him the penance of a public acknowledgement and recantation of them each and all. I will not require him to be at the expense of publishing 50,000 copies of the Recantation. I will guarantee that the Protestant Press shall send it forth on the wings of the wind, and that it shall reach the great body of those who have been misled by his statements, and render his "little volume" harmless for all future time. Let him perform this simple act of Restitution, and it will be of more avail than all the "sentiments" of "Dr. Ives," or "Father Lyman," or all the other Doctors and Fathers of Romandom. Meanwhile, against all the arguments that can be adduced in behalf of "Sacramental Confession," I put the simple fact that the Corinthian Christians were perhaps the most

* See Appendix C.

immoral of all the early converts to Christianity, some of them even getting drunk in the very presence of the Table of the Lord, and that it never once occurred to the Apostle, in full view of all this, to say, Let a man be examined by a Priest and receive absolution from him, and *so* let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup ; but that he said the diametric opposite : “ Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that cup ;” and, to the Galatians, “ Let every man prove his own work, and then shall he have rejoicing in himself alone, and not in another. For every man shall bear his own burden” (1 Cor. 11 : 28 ; Gal. 6 : 4, 5).

The Archbishop devotes the ten or twelve pages that immediately precede the Statistics to the consideration of Objections. Most of what he says has been already noticed by me, by anticipation. A word or two on one or two points.

“ Even our Manuals of Devotion have not escaped the lash of wanton criticism. They have excited the pious horror of some modern Pharisees, because they contain a table of sins for the use of those preparing for Confession. The same flower which furnishes honey to the bee supplies poison to the wasp” (p. 374).

I can furnish him with a more appropriate simile : The same carrion that is snuffed with delight by the buzzard, is an offence to civilized, not to say Christian, nostrils. I could prove the charges against some of these Manuals, if I could bring myself to soil this book with the filth with which they *reek*. The Apostle speaks pretty plainly in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans ; yet he says (Eph. 5 : 12) that there are things done in secret of which “ it is a shame even to speak :” and these are the very things that are *paraded* on the pages of these Manuals.

“ In the last objection it was charged that the votaries of Confession had no moral constraint at all. Now it is said that their conscience is bound in chains of slavery. Surely Confession cannot be hard and easy at the same time” (p. 373).

Why not? It all depends on the “ penitent” and on the Confessor. Take, in illustration, the following, which I translate from the *Manuel des Confesseurs : par L'Abbé J. Gaume, Vicaire général de Nevers. Sixième Edition, Paris, Gaume Frères. 1845 (p. 384).*

“ You are astonished perhaps to hear me say *a multitude of negligent confessors*. Come with me to a mission, place yourself at a confessional to hear the confessions ; out of a hundred penitents you will find sometimes eighty odd slaves of bad habits ; some of blasphemy, of perjury ; others of impurity, of theft, of hatred, and of evil thoughts ; ask them : How long, my child, have you been committing such faults?—Eight, ten, twenty years, Father.—Do you often fall into this sin?—Two and three times a week ; sometimes even every day.—Have you always confessed them?—Yes, Father.—Have you only one Confessor?—No, Father ; I have recourse sometimes to one, sometimes to another, according as I find him (or it) more accommodating (or advantageous) *suivant que je le trouve plus commode*.—So, within so many years you have had all the Confessors of this place, and even those of the environs?—Yes, Father.—Now tell me, Have these Confessors always absolved you?—Yes, Father.—But before absolving you, what have they said to you?—They have told me not to relapse.—But have they not made known to you your bad estate? Have they not given you means of correcting yourself? Have they not been careful to move your heart to contrition?—I will tell you, Father, that two or three have given me a brief exhortation ; but they have ended with giving me absolution.

—And have the others always absolved you, without giving you any exhortation?—Always, Father.

“Poor murdered souls (*pauvres créatures assassinées*)! This one penitent will reveal to you the weakness of almost all the Confessors of this place and of the environs. And what indignation, what pain, will you not feel in learning that out of eighty who habitually go to confession (*sur quatre-vingts habituels*) there are perhaps more than seventy who have been lost in this way by ignorant and unzealous Confessors. This dialogue seems to you a fiction. No, it is not so. Alas! What do you say? Would to God it were less practised, and were not founded on a deplorable and continual experience! The pious Cardinal Bona with good reason deplores a conduct so prejudicial to the salvation of souls. ‘This false charity,’ says he, ‘and this blameworthy indulgence (*damnable condescendence*), cause the greater part of Christians to pass their life in a continual disorder, and in an endless round of sacraments and sins, of confessions and relapses.’ To these sad words we may add the groans and tears of another Cardinal, no less pious and learned. Bellarmine, considering the too great facility of absolution irrespective of internal condition the ruin of poor souls, has written and proclaimed aloud that *non esset hodie tanta facilitas peccandi, si non esset etiam tanta facilitas absolvendi*—there would not be to-day [that was three hundred years ago] such facility of sinning, if there were not also such facility of absolving.”

To this inside testimony, that had gone through six editions a third of a century ago, no words of mine could add aught. It speaks for itself. Given human nature as it is, such will always be, as, in the long run, they always have been, the results of the Confessional: to the few, seeking to work out their salvation as servants, under the bondage of the law, a rough and hard

road, leading—who knows whither ; to the many, an easy and compendious path to purgatory, and thence to heaven ; to the soul that has “not received the spirit of bondage again to fear” (Rom. 8 : 15), but “the Spirit of adoption,” having “tasted the good word of God (Heb. 6 : 5), and the powers of the world to come,” an intolerable burden.

CHAPTER XXVI.

INDULGENCES.

AN Indulgence, in the Primitive Church, was simply a remission, in part, of the public penance imposed by the canons for public offences. It lay within the discretion of the Bishop to grant or withhold it, according as, in his judgment, the granting or withholding it would best serve the ends for which the penance was originally imposed. It was thus analogous to the pardoning power in the hands of the civil ruler ; a power that all admit the utility of, though, like every thing human, it may be sometimes abused.

“An Indulgence,” in the Roman Church, “is,” says the Archbishop, “simply a remission in whole or in part, through the superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and His saints of the temporal punishment due to God on account of sin, after the guilt and eternal punishment have been remitted” (p. 385).

It will thus be seen that there is no resemblance whatever between the two ; for the ancient Indulgence was the remission not of the penalty due to God, but of the penalty due to the Church. Over the penalty due to God the Church has no control. In the cases of Miriam (Num. 12) and David (2 Sam. 12) the “temporal penalty,” referred to by the Archbishop, was not

remitted at all ; it was rigidly exacted. The case of the "incestuous Corinthian," also referred to by him, is an instance of the *ancient* Indulgence, the remission of the penalty *due to the Church*, not to God, and has, therefore, nothing whatever to do with the modern Roman Indulgence.

But, says the Archbishop, "although the Church imposes canonical penance no longer, God has never ceased to inflict temporal punishment for sin" (p. 388). Yes, and He has never ceased to keep the power to inflict it and remit it in His own hands. The Primitive Church, as the Archbishop very well knows, never laid claim to any such power : it is a sheer invention of modern Rome.

The Archbishop talks, in his definition, above, of the "superabundant merits of Jesus Christ and His saints." "His saints" have no "superabundant merits : " when they have "done all," they are "unprofitable servants" (St. Luke 17 : 10) ; they have merely "done what was their duty to do." Even if they *had* superabundant merits, those merits, alongside of the Merits of Christ, would be simply *naught* ; for the finite alongside of the Infinite is *zero*, as every mathematician knows.

The Indulgences to which "reference is made," says the Archbishop (p. 388), in "the canons of the church of England," are as like to the Indulgences of the church of Rome as the pi into which the printer's type is sometimes knocked is to the pie with which we wind up our Christmas dinner ; the one "heavy as lead ;" the other indigestible possibly to weak stomachs, but—not hard to take.

The Archbishop admits (p. 390) "that Indulgences have been abused," but thinks those granted by Pope Leo X., "to bring to completion the magnificent church of St. Peter," were all right, because the church is so "*grand*," you know ; so "unrivalled in

majesty and beauty.” And then he quotes Byron’s description of it, by way of showing, of course, how *valuable* Indulgences are ! Doubtless he thinks Cardinal McCloskey’s Indulgences to sell liquor, and carry on gambling (see above, pp. 21–26), in the unfinished New York Cathedral, to get the means to finish it, were all right. For my part, I think those walls will smell of whiskey till doomsday (if they stand so long) spite of all the holy water the Cardinal sprinkled upon them at their dedication the other day. Evidently, the *Holy Roman Church* never changes.

But Leo didn’t sell Indulgences, after all ; “ he issued a Bull,” says the Archbishop (p. 390), “ promulgating an Indulgence to such as would contribute some voluntary offering toward the erection of the grand cathedral.” This reminds me of the scene in Molière’s *Bourgeois Gentilhomme*, where Monsieur Jourdain, who is very much exercised about his plebeian antecedents and relatives, is assured that his grandfather was no vulgar tradesman. He didn’t sell goods behind a counter : he simply gave people what they wanted, and they gave him money !

CHAPTER XXVII.

EXTREME UNCTION.

“ THIS unction is called *Extreme* because it is usually the last of the holy unctions administered by the Church.

“ The Apostle St. James clearly refers to this Sacrament, and points out its efficacy (St. James 5 : 14, 15) in the following words : ‘ Is any man sick among you ; let him bring in the priests [elders] of the Church, and let them pray over him, anointing him with oil in the name of the Lord, and the prayer of faith shall save

the sick man ; and the Lord shall raise him up ; and if he be in sins, they shall be forgiven him.' ”

The unction here prescribed by St. James, so far from being “ Extreme,” is for the very purpose of *healing* the sick, just as the anointing by the twelve (St. Mark 6 : 13) was ; whereas, the anointing prescribed by Rome is never performed except when the sick person is thought to be *in extremis*, and is therefore, as our 25th Article expresses it, a “ corrupt following of the Apostles.”

“ Protestants, though professing to be guided by the Holy Scripture, entirely disregard the admonition of St. James” (p. 396).

The Archbishop and the whole Roman Church, though professing to believe in Christ, “ entirely disregard” His injunction (St. Matt. 6 : 17), “ Thou, when thou fastest, *anoint thy head*, and wash thy face.” If the command of the servant is binding, *a fortiori* is the command of the Master.

CHAPTER XXVIII.

THE PRIESTHOOD.

As what little of argument there is in this chapter has been already considered, its thirteen pages of rhetoric need not detain us, except to notice an admission, and a mistake.

“ To the carnal eye,” says the Archbishop (p. 398), “ the Priest looks like other men.” According to the *Comely of Convocation*, “ People’s Edition,” it is the Anglican clergy, “ in whose face there is no reflection of the Sacramental Presence” (p. 111), implying that there *is* a reflection of it in the *face* of the Roman Priest—in whom “ the grace of Orders does not ap-

pear'' (F. 107), implying that it does *appear* in the Roman Priest. The Archbishop is right, and the Comedy is wrong. So much for the *Admission*.

The *Mistake* is in the first paragraph on page 403, where that is said to have been spoken to the Priests (Num. 16 : 8, 9) which was really spoken to the Levites ; for in the very next verse they are reproached, for that, not satisfied with being admitted to the lowest order of the ministry, they challenged to themselves the Priesthood also. The mistake is of consequence only as showing the inveterate habit of the Archbishop's mind.

CHAPTER XXIX.

CELIBACY OF THE CLERGY.

“ THE [Roman] Church requires her Priests to be pure in body as well as in soul, and to ‘present their bodies a living victim, holy, well-pleasing unto God.’ ” (p. 410).

This, if it means any thing to the purpose of this chapter, means that celibacy is a state of comparative purity, and marriage a state of comparative impurity. This, if carried out to its legitimate consequence, would abolish marriage among Christians ; for what the Apostle says (Rom. 12 : 1) requires, in these very words, of *all* Christians, as being themselves priests (1 St. Peter 2 : 5) (Rev. 1 : 6), that they “present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God.” Moreover, it reflects upon God, who “at the beginning” (St. Matt. 19 : 4) “made them male and female.” And said, “For this cause shall a man leave father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife : and they twain shall be one flesh.” It is needless to say

that there is not a shadow of authority in Scripture for this teaching of the Church of Rome : on the contrary, it is " expressly " declared by " the Spirit," speaking by the mouth of the Apostle (1 Tim. 4 : 1-5), to be a " doctrine of devils." I submit to the Archbishop's consideration this dilemma : Either his interpretation (p. 412) of 1 Tim. 4 : 12 and 2 Cor. 6 : 6 (in which he makes " chastity," or, as it is in our Version, " purity," mean *celibacy*), is false, or his own father and mother were unchaste. If he *will* cast such an imputation upon them, all I can do is to protest most vehemently against it. In Rev. 14 : 4, " defiled " refers not to marriage but to fornication. " Virgins," really such, are, of course, chaste ; married persons may be or may not be. To say that certain persons have not " defiled themselves," for that they are " virgins," does not, as the Archbishop insinuates, imply that all who are not virgins *have* defiled themselves. " Marriage is honorable in all," says the Apostle (Heb. 13 : 4), " and the bed undefiled." According to the Archbishop's reasoning, the marriage bed *cannot be* undefiled. The passages, Exod. 19 : 15, 1 Kings (Sam.) 21 : 4, 5, are interpreted by Eccles. 3 : 5, last clause ; according to the Archbishop's argument, the first of the two assertions of the Wise Man in this clause is false.

The preference is given by our Lord and his Apostle (St. Matt. 19 : 12 ; 1 Cor. 7 : 32-35) to the single life over the married in certain cases, for prudential reasons, and for its greater freedom from worldly anxieties. This is recognized by St. Chrysostom : " For the evil," saith he, " is not in the cohabitation, but in the impediment to the strictness of life." (*Hom. xx. in Matt.*)

The Archbishop admits (p. 412) that St. Peter was married, but claims that he gave up " the fellowship of his wife " after " his vocation," because he says (St. Matt. 19 : 27) he had left all and followed Christ, and

because the "wife" is enumerated by Christ, immediately after, among the things thus left. But all that this involves is, that he left them *so far as they interfered with his following Christ*; a thing which every layman, as well as clergyman, is bound to do; a thing the like to which, in a lower sphere, is recognized as a duty, and fulfilled as such, by every Officer of the Army and Navy. That St. Peter did *not* give up entirely "the fellowship of his wife" we know from the question of St. Paul, "Have we not power to lead about a sister, a wife, as well as other apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord, and Cephas?" (1 Cor. 9 : 5.) It is true the Archbishop's Version, following the Rhemish, as that follows the Vulgate, translates, "a woman, a sister;" but it is equally true that this is a gross mistranslation, made either from sheer ignorance, or else for theological reasons: the Greek cannot possibly bear that rendering. Instances of the construction in question are numerous, both in the New Testament and in the classic writers: "a man, a murderer" (Acts 3 : 14, Gr.); "a man, a merchant" (St. Matt. 13 : 45); "a man, an householder" (St. Matt. 20 : 1); "a man, a prophet" (St. Luke 24 : 19, Gr.); "a man, a wayfarer" (Iliad xvi. 263); "a man, a commander" (Plato, Ion. p. 540 d). See *Winer*, Seventh Edition, Andover, 1869, p. 523. In every instance of an appositive construction of this kind, the *defining* noun, in the Greek, comes last. It is a law of the language. Hence in St. Luke 4 : 26, "a woman, a widow," *γυνή* (*woman*), comes first; whereas, in 1 Cor. 9 : 5, *γυνή* (*wife*), comes last, and the Archbishop's Version, following the Rhemish, dishonestly, or ignorantly, transposes the words. Even if the Greek would bear that rendering, the word translated, "lead about," excludes it; for it *demonstrates* that the allusion is *not*, as alleged by the Archbishop, to "those pious women who voluntarily waited on the Apostles, and minister-

ed to them in their missionary journeys" (p. 418). That was an institution of a later day, and we all know what scandal it gave rise to ; insomuch that the Council of Ancyra (A.D. 315) had to enact, " We prohibit virgins from living with men as brothers." (Canon XIX.) The Prince of the Apostles was guilty of no such unseemly conduct as " leading about" with him another man's wife, or an unmarried woman. He left that to his successors, John XXIII., Innocent VIII., Alexander VI., etc., etc. The early Fathers understood the Apostle's language better than the Archbishop. " It was permitted even to the Apostles," says Tertullian, " to marry, and to lead about their wives with them : " *Licebat et Apostolis nubere et uxores circumducere.*—*De Castitat.* c. 8. —And Clement of Alexandria (Strom. l. iii. p. 535 ; Potter, cf. l. iv. p. 607) gives the same interpretation, and says moreover that St. Paul had a wife, and addressed her (Phil. 4 : 3) as " true yokefellow."

" Is it not becoming that a chaste Lord should be served by chaste ministers? (p. 414.) Certainly ; and just as " becoming" that he should be served by chaste laymen ; and therefore, if the Archbishop's interpretation of chastity were *consistently* held and acted on throughout Christendom, the Catholic Church would become extinct in one generation.

" We frequently hear of unmarried Bishop's and Priests laying down their lives for the faith. . . . But such heroic sacrifices are too much to be expected from men enjoying the domestic luxury and engrossed by the responsibility of a wife and children" (p. 418).

Why " too much ?" Did the Archbishop never read in Eusebius (l. viii. c. 9) of Phileas, Bishop of Thmuis, and Philoromus, who were " urged, in the persecution under Diocletian, to have pity on their wives and children, and, for their sakes, to save their own lives," but

were urged in vain? Did he never hear of John Rogers, whose wife, "with nine small children, and one at the breast," followed him to the stake, in the persecution under Bloody Mary? Are married physicians any less ready to face danger and death than unmarried ones? Why, then, should married clergy be? There is no ground for the imputation.

"Nor could the imagination picture, in its wildest moods, the majestic adversary of the Arian emperor attended on his flight up the Nile by Mistress Athanasius, nor St. John Chrysostom escorted in his wanderings through Phrygia, by the wife of his bosom arrayed in a wreath of orange blossoms" (p. 417).

Perhaps not. But it requires no "wild mood" of the imagination, but only a very tame, humdrum exercise of that faculty, to "picture" *Mistress John XXIII.*, *Mistress Innocent VIII.*, *Mistress Alexander VI.*, and a *hundred thousand* other *Mistresses*, in *fifty thousand* parsonages, in the middle and the South of Europe, in the thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth centuries. See, for *proof* of this, and a good deal more, the twenty-first chapter of Mr. Henry C. Lea's *Historical Sketch of Sacerdotal Celibacy*, Philadelphia, 1867.

CHAPTER XXX.

MATRIMONY.

AMONG the "Things I don't Understand," and which I think it would puzzle Father Curtis to explain, is how the marriage of a catholic to a heretic can be a Sacrament. Equally hard is it to comprehend how the marriage union can be a type of the union betwixt

Christ and his Church, and yet the married state be inferior in purity to the single state ; and how, if that be so, the marriage vow can be sacramental, and the vow of celibacy non-sacramental. And again ; I am puzzled to comprehend on what principle the Archbishop's Version (Baltimore, Lucas Brothers) translates *μυστήριον* *sacrament* in Eph. 5 : 32, and *mystery* in all the other *twenty-six* places in which it occurs in the New Testament ; especially, as the Rhemish Version, in six of those places, to wit, Eph. 1 : 9 ; 3 : 3, 9 ; Col. 1 : 27 ; 1 Tim. 3 : 16 ; Rev. 1 : 20, translates it *sacrament* ; thus making a sacrament of " the seven stars," and " the seven candlesticks of gold." Just here, things seem to be pretty much mixed up. One thing, however, seems clear : if Matrimony is a Sacrament, then, for the same reason, there ought to be twenty-six other sacraments of the New Testament, besides the six others of Rome.

In conclusion, I am happy to express my hearty concurrence with the Archbishop in regard to the Christian doctrine of divorce, and in regard to the evils which flow from its violation.

APPENDIX A. (p. 38).

EVEN if Barlow had not been consecrated, there would not have been a break in the Succession ; for every Bishop laying on hands at the Ordination of a Bishop, is a channel of conveyance of the Order, notwithstanding Rome's insistence to the contrary.* All that is requisite to the *valid* ordination of a Bishop, is that hands be laid on him, by a Bishop, for the purpose of ordaining him Bishop. Now whether Barlow was a consecrated Bishop or not—and no impartial jury would hesitate to give an affirmative verdict in a civil suit for a hundred thousand dollars turning upon the question of his consecration—Scory and Coverdale and Hodgkins were, admittedly, consecrated Bishops, and they *all* laid hands on Parker ; and they *all* said,† “ Take the Holy Ghost, and remember,” etc. ; and they did this, and said this, for the purpose of ordaining him Bishop, as is proved by the words they used in *presenting* him, to wit : “ Reverend Father in God, we offer and present to you this godly and learned man, to be consecrated Archbishop ; *ut Archiepiscopus consecratur*. In the actual conferring of the office and Order,

* Granting that Christ designed the ministry of His Church to be perpetuated by *tactual* succession, the presumption that He would not leave the perpetuation to the risk involved in the single-link theory of *modern* Rome is simply overwhelming.

† “ Cicestren., Hereforden., Suffraganeus Bedforden. et Milo Coverdallus Manibus Archiepiscopo impositis *dixerunt* Anglice, viz., ‘ Take the hollie gost, and remember,’ ” etc., *Haddan*, p. 359. Haddan gives the entire Latin Record, extending through 43 octavo pages.

to wit, in the laying on of hands, and saying of the words, Barlow did exactly what each of the other three did—neither more nor less. Now Rome admits that if Barlow was a consecrated Bishop, and if he used a valid *Form* in consecrating Parker (which he certainly did, seeing it was the very *Form* of the Roman Pontifical, and Parker had already been ordained Priest by the *Form* of the Roman Pontifical in the reign of Henry VIII.), Parker was *validly* consecrated by him. It follows, therefore, that Parker was validly consecrated by the other Bishops, whether Barlow was a consecrated Bishop or not.

APPENDIX B. (p. 187).

I TAKE the following from *The Genius of Popery opposed to the Principles of Civil and Religious Liberty*. Dublin: P. Dixon Hardy & Sons, Wareroom for Religious and Moral Publications, 23 Upper Sackville Street. London: W. Allan, Paternoster Row. 1850. P. 195 :

“THE PRIEST’S CURSE.

“The following dreadful Curse, being a form of excommunication of the Church of Rome, is extracted from ‘the Excommunication Service’ of that Church : [Here follows the Curse, at length, being the same as that given in *Tristram Shandy*, with slight variations in the phraseology, owing to both being translations from the original Latin, which is also given in *Tristram Shandy*.]

“It is only four years since it was proved in a court of justice that the Priest’s Curse is in full force and practice in Ireland—on the trial of the Rev. Luke Walsh, P.P., at the Carrickfergus Assizes, in the year

1846, for having cursed and excommunicated Charles McLaughlin (one of his congregation), a verdict of £70 damages, and 6*d.* costs, were adjudged against the priest."

In the face of this conviction in a court of justice, which must be, of course, on record now at Carrickfergus, and which must have been matter of public notoriety at the time of publication, and for the fact of which P. Dixon Hardy & Son's, of Dublin, and W. Allan, of London, made themselves responsible, what is the Archbishop's solemn denial good for, *unless* he can show from the Carrickfergus Records for 1846 that no such trial and conviction took place?

APPENDIX C. (p. 355).

I HAVE before me "A Defence of the Charge on Sacramental Confession, delivered by Bishop Atkinson, to the Clergy of his Diocese, in St. John's Church, Wilmington, May 22d, 1874; and A Refutation of the Reply made thereto, by the Rt. Rev. James Gibbons. By the Author of the Charge." It is a pamphlet of 39 pages. I had intended to quote its Statistics at large, but I have not room for them. I shall, therefore, content myself with the following paragraphs, referring the reader, for the rest, to the pamphlet itself:

"I undertook to show that . . . as compared with the usages of the Anglican Church, the system of Auricular Confession had wrought unfavorably to the moral interests of the countries in which it had been established. The statistics I adduced for that purpose, and for which I gave the authority of Mr. Seymour, and for which he cites official documents, *have not been disproved by Bishop Gibbons*, although he produces

others which are of a very contrary tendency. My authorities do not satisfy him, and his do not satisfy me ; and as I wish the truth to come out exactly as it is, I have used the efforts that I have already referred to to obtain, at first hand, the official papers elucidating the subject. These efforts have, so far, been only in part successful ; but I shall not discontinue them until I accomplish my object, if it can be accomplished.

“ I have obtained, however, among other documents, the ‘ Blue Books,’ for 1873, for England and Wales on the one hand, and for Ireland on the other. I find from these that of offences determined summarily, other than indictable offences, the English proportional number is less than the Irish by forty-eight per cent ; but that of indictable offences the Irish is less than the English by thirty-two per cent. That the Irish offences against property are less in proportion to the English, while the Irish offences against persons are greater.

“ But in coming to a fair estimate of the proportion of crime, some other considerations ought to be had in view. First, That the British Parliament has deemed it necessary, in order to repress crimes in certain parts of Ireland, to make it obligatory to have a license to carry arms in the districts, under what is called the ‘ Peace Preservation Acts,’ and thereby to disarm questionable persons.

“ These districts comprise twenty-six counties wholly, and five partially, proclaimed ; and seven cities or towns wholly proclaimed. This certainly tends very much to prevent crimes of violence. Again, the cities in Ireland have a much larger proportion of offences brought before the courts than the adjoining counties ; showing that there are more crimes, proportionally, committed in an urban than in a rural population ; while the population of England, compared with

that of Ireland, is much more urban than rural.* And again, that of the criminal population in Irish jails, there are only two per cent and a fraction of women and girls, and only three per cent and a fraction of men and boys, not of Irish birth, in 1873. While in England and Wales, in 1871 and '72, there were more than twenty-four per cent of women and girls, and more than fifteen per cent of men and boys, in English prisons, not born in England and Wales ; and of these strangers, more than twenty per cent of the women and girls, and more than eleven per cent of the men and boys, were of Irish birth.

“ This large percentage, then, of persons charged with violation of law, or under punishment for such violations, ought, in fairness, to be deducted from the number of criminals for which England is responsible, and added to that which must be charged upon Ireland. The truth is, that England, being a much richer country than Ireland, a large part of the criminal classes of the poorer country is disgorged on the more inviting shore, where they expect to find plunder. While England, then, has received immense benefits from the great body of Irishmen who serve in her armies and labor in her fields and factories, she has had to endure, to some extent, an accompanying penalty in the necessity laid upon her, by this emigration, of watching over, arresting, and punishing offenders with whom, otherwise, Irish justice would have had to deal. While, then, I believe, that in Ireland the tone of morality is much higher than in any other Roman Catholic country, I think *this* likewise ought to be considered : That the population of Ireland comprises a large number of Protestants, forming the leading class in the

* This explains why, according to the *Scotsman*, as quoted by the Archbishop (p. 383), “ Presbyterian and semi-Scotch Ulster is fully three times more immoral than wholly Popish and wholly Irish Connaught. Ulster is largely urban ; Connaught almost wholly rural.

community, embracing a great proportion of the principal merchants and manufacturers, and much the larger part of the landed proprietors; and that the government of the country itself is controlled by Protestants. It is, then, a very striking circumstance, that of those countries which have Roman Catholics to constitute the majority of the population, that is the most moral which is ruled by a Protestant government, and comprehends in its population a large and influential body of Protestants" (pp. 30-33).

"The Pope tells us, and so his adherents all do, that he has been despoiled of his territories. He tells us, furthermore, that he is a prisoner in his own palace. It is, to be sure, a very peculiar imprisonment. . . . Still he is a prisoner. Still he calls on mankind to witness the crimes and outrages of which he has been the victim. But men ask, who have committed these crimes? and who have been guilty of these outrages? The answer is, his own children, the very people he and his predecessors have been training for a thousand years—the men of Rome, the men of Italy. These are they who, according to his belief, have imprisoned their sovereign and robbed their spiritual father.

"Now if these are the results of that religious discipline which he enjoins, in his own city, under his own eye, working out its proper consequences under the most favorable circumstances, may not we, poor heretics and barbarians as we are, be excused for declining to submit to that discipline?

"I would beg leave, furthermore, to suggest one additional thought before I bid adieu to Bishop Gibbons. He concludes his pamphlet [and the 25th chapter of his 'little volume'] by quoting the language of the 'Catholic World,' to this effect: 'If we are not very much better than our neighbors, we are not any worse. But this will not do. On the principles of

those who thus speak, they are bound to be very much better. In their own belief, they alone have the full truth of the Gospel. Protestants are heretics, who deny many essential saving verities of the Christian religion.

"Now the Author of that religion teaches that it is the office of His truth to sanctify. They who exclusively possess it ought to have, and on His principles must have, exclusive sanctification, or, at the very least, the highest and most overwhelming evidences of sanctification. . . .

"Spain, on the principles of the Church of Rome, ought not only to be equal to England in religious earnestness, in morals, in prosperity, and in peace and happiness, but infinitely superior. Is it so?

"The South American Republics and Mexico ought greatly to excel the United States in the possession of all those blessings that dignify public life and sweeten private. Are they thus favorably distinguished? Let those answer who believe that all persons who dissent from the teachings of the Church of Rome and object to her practices, are heretics, if not infidels" (pp. 37-39).

I add, Rome claims about one seventh of the white population of the United States. The files of the public press would show, I think, that of those who end their days on the gallows, nearly, if not quite, one half are attended by priests of the Roman Church. Of the Mollie Maguires, if I remember rightly, all but one were so attended.



INDEX.

- Absolution, 323, 353
- Admissions of Roman Writers :
 - Bellarmino, 67, 221, 229, 231
 - Barnes, Father, 236
 - Castro, Alphonsus de, 223
 - Fisher, Cardinal, 235
 - Medina, 189
 - Pegna, Franciscus, 189
 - Sotus, 189
 - Stapleton, 190
 - Wiseman, Cardinal, 348
- Altar, 308
- Ancient Liturgies, 218, 222, 310
- Angel Worship, 193-196
- Apocrypha, 74-77
- Apostolicity of the Church, 32
- Apostolic Succession in the
 - Church of England, 36-41
- Archbishop's, The
 - Boasts about the Fathers, 191, 230, 231, 310, 328
 - Carelessness about Facts, 32
 - Contradictions of Himself, 50, 71, 72, 85, 185, 305, 310
 - Garbled Quotations, 113, 302, 337
 - Logic, 143, 172, 229
 - Perversions, 307, 343, 344
 - Sins of Omission, 113, 219, 220, 240, 337, 339, 342
- Archbishop's, The (*continued*):
 - Sympathy with the Nineteenth Century, 83
- Authorities :
 - Ambrose, 68, 89, 189, 190, 209, 219, 231, 232, 236, 339, 348
 - Aquinas, 229, 237
 - Aretas, 189
 - Athanasius, 67, 190, 192
 - Augustine, 68, 90, 99, 178, 189, 191, 195, 209, 211, 231, 232, 235, 288, 294, 306, 341, 348
 - Basil, 3, 68, 88, 97, 190, 231, 336
 - Beaumont, 250, 251
 - Bede, 98, 159, 220, 231
 - Bellarmino, 67, 221, 229, 230, 231, 237
 - Bernard, 231
 - Bossuet, 250
 - Camoy's, 242, 250
 - Canons of the Council of Trent, 328
 - Catechism of the Council of Trent, 8, 11, 236, 329
 - Castro, Alphonsus de, 223
 - Chrysostom, 91-95, 98(?), 189, 190, 191, 195, 231, 295, 306, 327, 342, 346, 348, 351, 364
 - Clement of Alexandria, 87, 231, 282

Authorities (*continued*):

Clement of Rome, 136, 145-148,
189, 190
Cyprian, 152, 176, 177, 190, 234
Cyril of Jerusalem, 67, 282, 296
De Maistre, 46
Dupin, 52, 76, 77, 83, 86-99, 107,
135, 145, 155, 164, 165, 177
Ephrem, 190
Epiphanius, 190
Erasmus, 135
Eusebius, 140
Euthymius, 189
Gregory the Great, 210, 231
Gregory Nazianzen, 97, 191, 231
Gregory Nyssen, 89
Hilary, 88, 231, 232
Hippolytus, 67
Homilies, Book of, 58, 216
Ignatius, 137, 292
Irenæus, 68, 87, 137, 138, 189,
190, 349
Janus, 52, 180, 243
Jerome, 68, 90, 97, 98, 140, 152,
190, 210, 231, 345
John Damascene, 68
Justin Martyr, 189, 293
Lactantius, 189, 209, 231, 232
Leibnitz, 208, 211
Luther, 3, 70, 84
Maguire, Father Tom, 174
Milner, 79, 80, 175, 278
Montalembert, 243
Norfolk, Duke of, 250, 251
Œcumenius, 189, 190
Origen, 67, 87, 97, 140, 189, 190,
209, 231, 288, 294, 333
Pascal, 250
Polycarp, 151

Authorities (*continued*):

Pusey, Dr., 177, 351
Socrates, 334
Sozomen, 335
Tertullian, 67, 189, 190, 198, 331,
349
Theodoret, 68, 97, 189, 190, 231
Theophylact, 189, 190, 231
Wiseman, Cardinal, 348
Babylon (1 St. Peter, v.), 134-136
Baptism, 278
Infants Unbaptized, "in limbo,"
279, 280
Bishops' Declaration about, 280
Effects of, Illustrations, 281-283
Minister of, 325
Barnum's Happy Family, 60, 114
Bible, and Church, 61
Inspired, 72, 73
Genuine, 74
Apocrypha, 74, 77
Vulgate, Errors of, 78, 80, 213,
238, 307
Translations of, 79
Copies (before printing), 81-83
Difficulties of, 84-87
To be Read by the People—so
say the Fathers, 87-95
Objections, 95-99
Epistles, written to the Laity,
99-100
Testimony of, to Lord's Day,
102, 103
Contains all things necessary to
Salvation, 104
Difficulties of the Roman
Theory, 104, 106
Prohibited to *the People*, 106,
111

Bible (*continued*):

- Our English Translation of, 79, 80, 112
- "Bloody Mary," 276
- Brazen Serpent, 207
- Brummagem, 163
- Camoy's, 242, 250
- Carroll, 242, 250
- Cathedral Fair, 21
- Cathedral Pews, 27
- "Catholic," 31, 32
- Celibacy—Chastity, 363
- Ceremonies, 310
- Church of England and Henry VIII., 34-42
- Confession (*see* Penance)
- Convent Schools, 245-247
- Cursing, 186, 187
- Dead, Prayers for, 218
 - Did not Involve Purgatory, 213-223
 - Why* the Dead were Prayed for, 221
 - Prayer for a Place of "Refreshment," 222, 315
- Development of New Dogmas, 11-15
- Dominicans and Franciscans, 13, 14
- "Eldad and Medad," 325
- Eucharist, 286
 - Real Presence, 286
 - Transubstantiation, 287
- Excommunication, 19
- Extreme Unction, 361
- Faith, in Relation to Infallibility, 56, 57
- Fathers, List of, 318
- Father Tom Maguire, 174

- Flounce and Furbelow, 312
- Flowers, 321
- Henry VIII., 34
- High Church and Low Church, 60, 254
- Immaculate Conception, 278
- Image Worship, 204
- Incense, 321
- Indulgences, 359
- Infallibility, 168
- Inquisition, 263
- Inspiration, 72
- Invocation of Saints, 188
- Jewish Church,
- Latin in the Mass, 317
- Lights, 320
- Luther, 302-304
- Magna Charta, 239, 240
- Mariolatry, 198-204, 214-216
- Maryland Toleration, 256
- Masonry, 9
- Mass, Sacrifice of, 305
- Matrimony, 367
- Massacre of St. Bartholomew, 272
- Missal, 314
- Morality of the Confessional, 355
- Mortal and Venial Sin, 223
- Mumbling, 320
- Penance, 322
 - "Matter" of it, 322
 - Power of the Keys, 323
 - Defined by Council of Trent, 328
 - Anciently Public (till A.D. 668), 331-348
 - Testimony of the Fathers, 331-345
- Penitentiary Presbyter, 334
- Confession, not an Ordinary Remedy, 326

Penance (*continued*):

Roman Manuals, 356

The Abbé Gaume, 357

Let the Archbishop *Confess* his
Misdoings, 355

Persecution, 261

Peter,

His Matrimony, 185, 364-366

His Patrimony, 185

Popes:

Fabian, 284

Gregory the Great, 210

Honorius, 54

Innocent, 210

Leo the Great, 155, 156

Leo X., 26

Pius IV., 5, 12

Victor, 148

Vigilius, 52

Primacy of Peter, 112

Purgatory, 223

Prayer-Book, 18, 316

Priests' Curse, 187

Refreshment, 315

Relics, 216

Saints (*see* "Invocation")

Sacrifice, 306-310

Sects, 16

Seven Sacraments, 277

"Shawl of Network," 44

Supremacy, 143

Supreme Court, 168-170

Symbols, 207, 216

Toleration, "Intolerable," 241

Tradition,

Unwritten, 66, 67

"With its Hundred Tongues,
309

Temporal Power, 179

Tristram Shandy, 187

Washington and Richmond, 146

Weathercock, 216

Wilberforce, 10







Deacidified using the Bookkeeper process
Neutralizing agent: Magnesium Oxide
Treatment Date: Jan. 2006

Preservation Technologies
A WORLD LEADER IN PAPER PRESERVATION

111 Thomson Park Drive
Cranberry Township, PA 16066
(724) 779-2111



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 017 318 493 1